

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

**EIGHTH SESSION**

**Official Records**



**438th  
PLENARY MEETING**

**Monday, 21 September 1953,  
at 10.30 a.m.**

**New York**

**C O N T E N T S**

General debate [continued] .....	51
Speeches by Mr. Vyshinsky (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. Cooper (Liberia)	

**President: Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi PANDIT (India).**

**General debate [continued]**

**SPEECHES BY MR. VYSHINSKY (UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS) AND MR. COOPER (LIBERIA)**

1. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): It is the established practice of the General Assembly to begin the work of each session with a general debate in which it takes stock of the previous year's activities, assesses the international situation, and considers future developments in international relations and the various problems before it as well as the methods for dealing with them. At this session, too, we must in the first place consider the international situation, the nature and the particular features of relations among States, and the role of the United Nations as an international organization which was set up eight years ago for the purpose of helping to settle international problems and to save succeeding generations from the scourge and horrors of a new war.

2. My Government therefore attaches great importance to the work and the role of the United Nations, whose duty it is to help bring about a settlement of international problems and the strengthening of international co-operation and the peace and security of the peoples. The Soviet Union Government recently reaffirmed its intention of giving vigorous support to those aims.

3. It must be said, however, that at the present time the United Nations is far from being what it ought to be and what all peace-loving peoples would wish it to be. The Organization is going through a period of grave crisis, for its function has been reduced to that of a mere instrument of the North Atlantic aggressive bloc. That such is the case has become very much apparent in the past few years, when its name has been used to cloak foreign intervention in Korea in an attempt to legalize the bloody war which was inflicted on the Korean people more than three years ago.

4. The war went on for over three years, causing innumerable casualties and creating the danger of grave international difficulties and even of another world war. The signing of the Korean armistice has to a certain extent helped to relieve the tension in international relations, in spite of all the resistance and opposition of those reactionary forces which, by means of acts of provocation of the kind employed

in Korea and Germany, have sought to increase such tension, to create still more international complications, to test the strength of fascist organizations, and to extend subversive action against the peoples' democracies and the Soviet Union.

5. In his well-known book, *A foreign policy for Americans*, published in 1951, Senator Taft stated that one of the main lines of United States foreign policy should be the waging of an underground war in the rear of the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies. It is well known, too, that in an article called "A policy of boldness", published in *Life* in 1952, Mr. John Foster Dulles elaborated a programme for such an underground war. Syngman Rhee sought to act in accordance with that policy, if we can call it by such a name, when he tried to prevent the signing of the Armistice Agreement in Korea, and so did those who tried to stir up trouble in Germany, hired and organized by those extreme reactionary groups who fear any lessening in international tension.

6. But this policy has seriously missed fire, the criminal plans of the enemies of peace have miscarried. This policy is meeting ever greater obstacles. Surely it is to these obstacles that some representatives have referred in their speeches at this session, as for instance when Sir Zafrulla Khan, representative of Pakistan and its Minister for Foreign Affairs, spoke [437th meeting] about the instability of peace in the Far East, Korea and elsewhere, and said that Korea and the Far East were not the only places where the tension threatened the peace. This is the result of a policy of imperialism or colonialism, as some representatives have called it when speaking here of the necessity of putting an end to it.

7. Proof of the fact that the so-called policy of strength is suffering defeat after defeat was given recently, during the discussion of the Korean question at the General Assembly's seventh session, when nearly one-third of the delegations failed to support the fifteen-Power draft resolution which opposed a round-table conference. The situation is in no way changed by the fact that the pro-American camp succeeded in putting through, in the name of the United Nations, a General Assembly decision which was clearly not in accordance with the Armistice Agreement and was a flagrant violation of paragraph 60 of that agreement, which certainly does not stipulate that the conference shall consist only of representatives of the two sides whose troops fought in Korea, as the United States and its followers have insisted. Such a situation can in no way be regarded as satisfactory.

8. The Indonesian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Sunario, rightly declared [437th meeting] that the participants in the conference on the Korean question should include not only the belligerents but also non-belligerent countries for which a Far Eastern

settlement was a matter of immediate concern and which might contribute to the success of the conference.

9. It is also clear, from the telegram sent by Mr. Chou En-lai, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and from the statement of Mr. Li Don Gen, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, that neither of those countries find it possible to accept the recommendation adopted at the seventh session, and they propose that the Assembly should reconsider the question.

10. As representatives already know, the Soviet Union proposed in the General Committee [88th meeting] that the Secretary-General's note [A/2480] should be included in the agenda of this session. It felt that the just demands of the Korean and Chinese Governments with regard to the composition of the conference must be met; if they were not met, the sovereign rights of those peoples and States would be grossly injured, to the great advantage of the enemies of peace who—make no mistake about it—have no interest in the convening and successful conduct of the political conference on Korea.

11. It is to be observed, however, that the United States remains obdurate in this matter. It refuses to withdraw from the position it has wrongly taken up on the question of the composition of the political conference. It is doing all in its power to prevent the discussion of the question at the present session of the General Assembly. Mr. Dulles did not hesitate to say that the political conference would be a test of the will to peace of the other side, thus showing that the conference itself and the important problems which it is called upon to decide are of no great interest to the United States. It must further be said that, on the matter of the unification of Korea too, the position of the United States, as it appears from the speech Mr. Dulles made here on this very rostrum on 17 September [434th meeting], is identical with that of Syngman Rhee. Mr. Dulles made it quite clear in his statement that the United States intends to seek a solution to this problem which is absolutely unjustified and totally divorced from reality, involving what amounts to the subjugation of North Korea under the anti-national régime of Syngman Rhee, whose power would then extend over the whole of Korea.

12. We are firmly convinced that the General Assembly recommendations concerning the political conference on Korea must be brought fully into line with the Armistice Agreement. The conclusion of that agreement was a great victory for peace, and that victory must be consolidated. The conclusion of the agreement bore witness to the growth of the forces of peace, and it justifies the rising hopes for the success of future endeavours to ensure a peaceful settlement of the Korean question and other controversial issues, and the restoration of normal international relations. The Armistice Agreement also bore witness to the defeat of the so-called dynamic foreign policy, the policy of strength, which reactionary circles in the United States and its allies have persistently tried to put into effect; they have sought to proceed, not by negotiation, but by using dictatorial methods, apparently overestimating their own strength and the means at their disposal, and misjudging the realities

of the international situation and the real balance of power in the world.

13. The signing of the Korean Armistice Agreement, as Mr. Malenkov, head of the Soviet Government, pointed out, was an important landmark in the struggle of all the forces of peace against aggression and international gambles. It clearly showed that the forces of peace can achieve just solutions of thorny international problems if they remain firm and unyielding. The head of the Soviet Government further pointed out that it would be unforgivable to ignore the latest intrigues of the aggressive forces in the East, which are seeking to disrupt the armistice in Korea and to aggravate the situation in Asia and the Pacific basin.

14. The historic service rendered by the heroic Korean people and the gallant Chinese People's Volunteers was that they repelled the attempts of the interventionists in Korea and dealt a heavy blow to the far-reaching plans of the reactionary forces which were seeking to suppress the people's liberation movement in Asia.

15. One cannot fail to note the recent increase in the activity of aggressive circles in the western world, which are opposing, more than ever before, all endeavours to ease the tension in international relations, and which are extending their subversive activity against the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and the peoples' democracies, in accordance with the plans of their so-called cold war strategy. It is significant, in this connexion, that the so-called Psychological Strategy Board, in the United States, has quite recently been converted into a new specialized body with even more specific functions. This new organization, according to the American Press, has to elaborate and carry out various tasks of vital importance to the nation in the sphere of high strategy. The main reason for the creation of this special new organization, also psychological in character, is, as the American Press frankly puts it, that words are no longer enough in the cold war, and that the ruling circles in the United States believe that deeds are more effective than words in the cold war against the Soviet Union.

16. This is a clear indication that new adventures are being planned of the type perpetrated in Berlin in June of this year, adventures which are obviously bound to cause further international tension. The imperialist magnates, desirous of maintaining the huge profits which they derive from the arms race and the militarization of industry, wholeheartedly support the policy of aggravating international relations; as before, they are gambling on war. This policy poisons the international atmosphere, heightens international tension and injures the vital interests of all peace-loving peoples.

17. The head of the United States delegation, Mr. Dulles, in his speech to the Assembly a few days ago, said that the United States was quite prepared to explore ways to end the present tension and that the United States would never grow weary or discouraged in its quest for peace. He particularly emphasized that the need for harmonizing the actions of nations, as the United Nations Charter requires, was never more urgent than now. We were also told that the United States had, as it were, opened the doors of the house of peace and invited the Soviet Union to enter. This, according to Mr. Dulles, was not a chance remark,

but a stage already provided for in the development of the Eisenhower foreign policy. He added that the time had come for the United States to embark on a true peace offensive and to act realistically in order to win the battle for peace. That is what Mr. Dulles said on 17 September.

18. Such statements by responsible political leaders warrant careful consideration. On the other hand, the numerous facts which are at variance with them cannot be ignored. Mr. Dulles' statement to the General Assembly on 17 September contained no evidence to corroborate his words. The same is true of his other speeches, for instance, those he made to the American Bar Association in Boston on 26 August and to the American Legion Convention on 2 September. It is also true of the whole trend of United States foreign policy. On the contrary, many facts could be cited as evidence of entirely opposite intentions. Let us examine this question.

19. In the speech he made in Boston, on 26 August, to the American Bar Association, Mr. Dulles argued the need for and advisability of aggressive organizations such as the North Atlantic bloc, to which the United States had entrusted the responsibility of safeguarding international security. That was clear from his speech. The reason given for this step was that the United Nations had failed to safeguard international security. It is clear that such a statement is directly at variance with the statement Mr. Dulles made here, to the effect that the primary purpose of the United Nations was to maintain international peace and security and that the Charter itself had given the United Nations the mandate "to be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations". In Boston, Mr. Dulles praised other aggressive blocs and alliances such as the so-called security or mutual defence agreements between the United States and the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand and Japan, the so-called agreement on mutual defence with Chiang Kai-shek, a similar agreement with Syngman Rhee and a whole series of other agreements on military bases which will, according to Mr. Dulles, give United States armed forces facilities for more effective operations. Later on in the same speech, Mr. Dulles spoke of the need to offset what he said the Soviet Prime Minister had called the monolithic unity of the Soviet system.

20. Such talk about offsetting the unity of the Soviet system certainly does not agree with what we have heard here about the allegedly peaceful purposes of United States foreign policy. The unity of Soviet society has never been as monolithic, nor the brotherly friendship of the Soviet people as strong and indestructible, as now, a fact which is most disturbing to the enemies of peace, who nurture vain hopes of shaking that unity and preventing the further progress of the Soviet State and its development in the economic, political and cultural spheres. Is the plan to offset Soviet unity compatible with any truly peaceful purposes and activities? There can be no doubt that the only possible answer to this question is in the negative. A policy directed at destroying the social and political structure of any other country cannot be called a policy of peace, nor can it have any justification. The position adopted by the United States delegation, headed by Mr. Dulles, on the question of the representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, is another eloquent indication of the lack of any real desire on the part of the United

States to relax international tension. Only a few days ago, the United States delegation exerted every effort to prevent the Assembly from inviting the representatives of the People's Republic of China to occupy China's legitimate seat in the United Nations and its organs. The aggressive policy towards the People's Republic of China and the Chinese people and the support and protection given to the Chiang Kai-shek bands, as the alleged "government" of China, are incompatible with the interests of peace and international security and co-operation. Such a policy, which aims at settling international questions without the participation of the legal representatives of the Chinese People's Republic, is inevitably doomed to failure.

21. At the beginning of his statement on 17 September, Mr. Dulles said that the United States recognized that its views might not always prevail. "When that happens," he said, "we shall no doubt regret it, but we shall not sulk. We shall try to accept the results philosophically..." Only a few days ago, however, we saw what Mr. Dulles meant by "philosophically". The incident involved India. The United States delegation, headed by Mr. Dulles, adopted its own particular brand of philosophical approach to the question of Indian participation in the political conference on the Korean question, categorically opposing any such participation. There is a manifest tendency, here, to adopt an intolerant attitude to anyone who does not support, or fully support, the United States point of view. By adopting such a position the United States has repeatedly shown that in order to attain its ends it will not shrink from flagrantly violating the sovereign rights of peoples and States who are going their own way, regardless of its orders.

22. The fact that the United States is not interested in relaxing international tension is also clear from the part of Mr. Dulles' speech devoted to the revision of the United Nations Charter or, rather, to propaganda to the effect that advantage should be taken of a revision of the Charter to do away with one of the fundamental principles on which the United Nations is based, namely, the principle of the unanimity of the permanent members in the consideration and solution of problems in the Security Council. This principle ties the hands of those who wish to weaken the Security Council's role and its significance. The protagonists of revising the Charter do not wish to transform the United Nations into the effective instrument for peace of which the United States representative, Mr. Dulles, spoke, but into the tool of an aggressive policy threatening and undermining peace. This is a further proof of the absence, among ruling circles in the United States, of any desire to remove international tension. The raising of the question of revising the Charter, therefore, particularly at this juncture, undoubtedly can and will give certain Powers the opportunity of making fresh attempts to undermine the United Nations and particularly the Security Council, thereby undermining the very cause of peace. For to undermine the instrument for peace, with which the struggle for peace may be successfully waged, is tantamount to undermining the cause of peace itself.

23. It is patent that the United States Senate has already been enlisted in the campaign to revise the Charter. It has appointed a special committee under the chairmanship of Senator Wiley. It should also be noted that the State Department is trying to draw into

the campaign certain private United States organizations and groups—as Mr. Dulles said—on whose support the State Department counts in this reactionary enterprise. There is every indication that the campaign for the revision of the Charter is to be turned into a cold-war campaign in order to arouse reactionary sentiments and thereby to increase international tension.

24. If the present international situation is analysed, numerous facts inevitably lead to the conclusion that the divergencies of opinion among the Atlantic bloc countries are becoming more marked. It is impossible to overlook the ever-growing demand of large sections of the community in a number of countries belonging to that bloc, and also in a number of other countries, that international disputes should be settled by negotiation, so that States might conclude appropriate international agreements which could help to relax international tension. It must be pointed out that, while the enemies of peace are hypocritically calling for negotiations, they are at the same time imposing conditions which are clearly designed to make the negotiations either impossible or useless. Day by day the demands for the settlement of unresolved international questions are growing stronger, and the weight of international opinion behind them is constantly increasing as the Soviet Union, in unswerving pursuit of its policy of peace, and achieving new successes in its internal affairs, overthrows the obstacles which the enemies of peace have sought to place in the way of such a settlement.

25. Soviet foreign policy is consistent and seeks to defend peace and international security. The considerable improvement in international relations shows that that policy produces positive results. After a long period of growing tension, and for the first time in post-war years, the international atmosphere has become somewhat less charged and millions upon millions of people have been strengthened in their hope that a way can be found to settle outstanding international disputes. Such a policy is in line with the hopes and deep yearnings of all peoples for a lasting and solid peace, as the head of the Soviet Government, Mr. Malenkov, strongly emphasized in his speech to the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union. The whole course of its policy from its earliest days proves that the Soviet Union seeks to strengthen good-neighbourly relations with other countries and that it has no territorial claims on any State, including its neighbours. Thirty years ago Lenin, the great founder of the Soviet State, declared:

“Our experience has bred in us the firm conviction that only if the greatest attention is paid to the interests of the various nations can the grounds for conflicts, mutual mistrust and fear of intrigues be removed, and the kind of confidence created, particularly among workers and peasants speaking different languages, which is absolutely essential for the achievement of peaceful relations among nations and the successful development of all that is valuable in contemporary civilization.”

This is the path the Soviet Union follows firmly and consistently in order to develop and strengthen international relations in accordance with the unshakable principle of its foreign policy, namely, respect for national freedom and the sovereignty of all countries, large and small.

26. The Soviet Union is carrying out its policy of peace in close and friendly co-operation with the countries of the democratic camp, a camp where there are no internal contradictions or struggles and whose members are linked by the strong bonds of complete mutual trust and respect, sincere friendship and disinterested mutual assistance. This is a mighty source of strength and progress for the peace-loving, democratic countries. In the face of such incontrovertible facts, of such universal historical significance, how pitiful are the attempts to distort and cast a shadow over the relations, based on mutual confidence, respect and fraternal co-operation, between the Soviet Union and the countries in the democratic camp.

27. The picture is not the same among the countries in the North Atlantic bloc. The aggressive intentions of the organizers of that bloc were evident from the outset; the bloc was created for purposes entirely foreign to the defence aims by which its organizers tried to justify it, claiming that defence was its basic, or even its only *raison d'être*. This bloc is not defensive, as its instigators and organizers maintain. It is intended to prepare for a new world war to achieve the mad idea of world domination. The North Atlantic bloc is really a military alliance working towards purely aggressive ends. It constitutes a major threat to the cause of peace. Its existence is in the interests only of those who are not concerned with strengthening peace, whom peace does not suit and who have placed their stakes on war rather than peace. This is particularly clear today, when the bloc has been in existence for four years, despite all the attempts and devices of its organizers to depict it as the best, if not the only, hope for peace.

28. As we know, a special role within the North Atlantic bloc is assigned to the so-called European army. This is proved by the fact that Mr. Dulles and Mr. Stassen made a special journey to Western Europe to secure the ratification of the treaty and the rapid completion of arrangements for organizing such an army with the participation of West German armed forces; those forces, under the command of former Hitlerite generals, bent on revenge, are given a very important place in that army. Hence Mr. Dulles was able to say—and here I have no reason to disagree with him—speaking of the results of his journey to Europe, that the so-called European defence community, the core of which, according to him, was composed of the six countries which signed the Paris Treaty, must be based on German armed forces, meaning, of course, West German armed forces.

29. Reactionary elements in the United States and certain other capitalist countries are stimulating the war psychosis by an armaments race, military manoeuvres, and the elaboration of various plans for acts of provocation and strategic plans, and are trying to induce terror among their populations by lying propaganda concerning the military preparations of the Soviet Union and absurd rumours about the supposed “Soviet menace”. In his statement to the General Assembly on 17 September, Mr. Dulles touched on this theme, seeking to answer the question which he himself had asked: “Why do we fear?”

30. A book recently published in New York, called *Pentagon Politics*, by the former President of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Colonel Neblett, seems to me to provide a direct

answer to the question which puzzles Mr. Dulles. In that book we read:

"... we have lived through seven years of fear of a Russian surprise attack and of communism at home. The Pentagon has converted these fears into military control of our nation... The public has been frightened into giving our military leaders a regular military force of 5 million men and women... If the Pentagon and certain politicians can keep the fear of communistic aggression fresh in the public's mind for a few years longer, all of our men of military age and many of our women will belong to the professional armies. We will then be a military State similar to that of Hitler's, with which he terrorized the world."

And further along the author states that "the fear of a Russian attack will pass as soon as the public understands that the fear... was generated by the Pentagon to frighten Congress into authorizing our big professional army".

31. These are the views of a rather well-informed person, a man who served for thirty-four years in the United States Army, and is a member, as I said, of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, and the author of a number of other books on military, political and other topics—this is his reply to the question which concerns some of those present here: "Why do we fear?" That is why.

32. I must say that, although the foolish fabrications spread by the enemies of the peace about the threat supposedly represented by the USSR are credited less and less by fewer and fewer people, the manufacture and dissemination of such subversive rumours continue. The enemies of peace are now trying to frighten the peoples with the fact that the Soviet Union possesses the secret of manufacturing the hydrogen bomb; they did the same thing a few years ago when the Soviet Union mastered the secret of manufacturing the atomic weapon. They are trying to cause alarm by these facts for the purposes of the armaments race.

33. In its communication of 20 August, the Soviet Government declared that, now as before, any such alarm was unfounded, because the Soviet Union continued to pursue an unswerving policy of strengthening the peace and developing co-operation and economic relations with all the States which pursued the same purposes, a policy truly designed to promote the settlement of contentious international questions. Soviet foreign policy is indeed a peace-loving policy, a policy of peace and friendship among peoples. The nature of this policy, its purposes and principles, determine the position taken by the Soviet Union on all international questions, including those on which Mr. Dulles dwelled in his statement. The United States Secretary of State tried very hard to represent the foreign policy of the United States as a policy of peace.

34. We have seen similar attempts in the past. This is not the first time that conciliatory declarations about economic and political co-operation and various so-called mutual defence pacts and treaties, etc., are used to conceal the true purposes of the United States policy of world domination, a policy utterly at variance with professions of love for peace. It is impossible, however, to conceal the true nature and purposes of the military measures which are being carried out openly and energetically by the countries of the North Atlantic bloc, in pursuance of their policy of increasing

international tension, this despite references to defence and the utilization of methods authorized by the Charter, methods which, as Mr. Dulles said, no one need fear and which he described as an "enlightened way" of ensuring international security.

35. How can anyone describe as an "enlightened way" the so-called "community defence system", when it was created in contravention and violation of the Charter, which does show the proper way to combat aggression and defend peace and international security? In reality—and there are many facts to prove this—a system of military measures to attain aggressive purposes is being set up under the pretext of the so-called system of "community defence". The creation of this system is designed to weaken and undermine the United Nations and cannot possibly be reconciled with the statement that its organizers allegedly want to make the United Nations a more effective instrument for peace. How can there be any question of an "enlightened way" in the face of a mad armaments race, a race to manufacture atomic bombs, a constant increase of the staggering burden of military budgets for the peoples of the Anglo-American bloc? In such circumstances, it cannot be claimed that these so-called collective measures represent an "enlightened way". Coming as they do from the North Atlantic bloc, they cannot but inspire all peace-loving peoples with the gravest fears for peace and international security, just as the entire activity of the North Atlantic bloc inspires fear, for, though ostensibly formed for purposes of defence, it is in fact the main threat to world peace.

36. The "community defence system", as it is called, can no more safeguard peace or establish neighbourly international relations than can the policy of force out of which it arose. The United States representative, Mr. Dulles, seems to have realized this, judging from what he wrote in his book, *War or Peace*, in 1950, setting forth his views on the foreign policy of the United States. He wrote as follows:

"What we lack is a righteous and dynamic faith. Without it, all else avails us little. The lack cannot be compensated for by politicians, however able; or by diplomats, however astute; or by scientists, however inventive; or by bombs, however powerful."

Yet the whole so-called "community defence system" is based on the use of force, on the application of sanctions, in other words, on recourse to war against any State that may be declared an aggressor—I should like to stress this—by the members of the North Atlantic bloc, although such a declaration in itself is illegal and is a gross violation of the United Nations Charter, which provides that such matters are to be decided by the Security Council and by the Security Council alone, not even by the General Assembly.

37. In view of this, it is easy to understand the statement made by the Swedish Government that it would not be able to take the responsibility of joining in possible sanctions if the probable result of its participation were to involve the country in a world war.

38. This is most important and throws light on the whole question of so-called collective measures, which have been reinforced by very far-reaching rights to proclaim any country an aggressor. The handful of countries which declared Korea an aggressor after attacking it, or rather, which supported the original attack made by Syngman Rhee and then embarked on



an operation of intervention, have the power under the North Atlantic Treaty to proclaim any country an aggressor. But under the Charter that power lies solely with the Security Council. Now we are told that this so-called "community defence system" is, if you please, the safeguard, the bulwark and the mainstay of the United Nations. What is being done under this disguise of so-called "community defence" is really aimed against collective security. The talk about collective security is simply a smoke-screen for military plans, which of course are incompatible with measures to promote real collective security.

39. A vitally important question, that commands universal interest, is that of Korea, of the unification of that country and of the political conference which is to be convened not later than 28 October:

40. Certain representatives, in particular the representative of the United States, have repeated in this connexion the long since disproved and discredited charge that the aggression came from North Korea. There is no need, of course, for me to go into the details of this question, which is fully three years old already, and I do not believe that anybody would expect me to do so. All through the last three years, since 1950, we have repeatedly adduced much evidence of what the real situation was in 1950, when the People's Democratic Republic of Korea was attacked by the armed forces of Syngman Rhee, that had been organized, equipped and trained by American military instructors and officers. But since the subject invariably comes up, and some representatives speaking after me will probably be referring yet again to aggression on the part of North Korea, I must remind you of just one thing which gives conclusive support to the abundant evidence that the attack on the territory of North Korea was planned in advance and carried out by the armed forces of Syngman Rhee's puppet government, with foreign support. I want to bring this fact to your attention, and to the attention of those speaking after me who again talk about aggression having been committed by North Korea, so that they may finally renounce their conspiracy of silence concerning the value of the evidence which for over three years I have consistently repeated from this rostrum, and which has been sedulously ignored by those who simply repeat the parrot cry: "The Government of North Korea is the aggressor, the attack came from North Korea", and so on, without bearing out their contention in any way. I should like to put before you one last, comparatively new, piece of evidence to show that the opposite is true.

41. In the spring of 1950, thirteen members of the National Assembly in South Korea were tried and given sentences of up to ten years' imprisonment. If you read the indictment against these thirteen representatives, setting forth the counts against them, you are bound to note the fourth charge: protesting against the South Korean forces invading North Korea. You see what this means? Obviously that members of the National Assembly were sentenced by Syngman Rhee, thrown into prison and sent to hard labour simply for having spoken against the invasion of North Korea which was then being undertaken. Now the wording of this count was: protesting against invasion. Does not this mean that preparations were being made for invasion? And that those who tried to prevent the preparations were thrown into prison, although they were members of the National Assembly and thus

representatives of the people? Their attitude was regarded as a crime against the State, for which they were condemned and severely punished. This is plain proof that Syngman Rhee and his protectors were really preparing to invade North Korea and effected the invasion at the suitable moment. In face of this and the other unchallengeable evidence, how is it possible to go on calmly spreading the false and disproved story that it was North Korea which committed aggression, and to sing the praises of this disgraceful passage in the history of the United Nations, when the Organization was used as the tool for a policy of aggression and a cloak for foreign intervention in Korea?

42. It is typical that at the precise moment when United States diplomats talk, as we have heard them do here in the Assembly, about the alleged intention of their country to "win the battle for peace", Mr. Wilson, the United States Secretary of Defense, assures the Senate that the armed forces of the United States, supported by those of its allies—that is, presumably the armed forces of the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Italy and so forth, and above all, of course, the armed forces of Western Germany, in which the United States is especially interested—will be able to "win the war" against the Soviet Union, and General Clay tells the graduate class of the West Point Military Academy that the atomic war is the key to the United States national security.

43. In the West, the insupportable burden of armaments is causing increasing unrest, and the conviction is daily growing that the so-called strategic requirements determined by the leaders of the North Atlantic bloc are quite unjustified, and that the "threat from the East", by which those leaders attempt to justify the armaments race, is non-existent.

44. The reactionary forces in the countries of Western Europe are putting their money on Adenauer's Western Germany, declaring that its armed forces are of vital importance for the "viability of Europe". Now the point of the so-called Bonn Agreement and the so-called Paris Agreement is the incorporation of the armed forces of Western Germany, organized under the command of Hitlerite generals, in the so-called "European Army" and thus in the armed forces of the North Atlantic bloc. But to do that is to revive German militarism and create a dangerous focus of fresh aggression. It means breaking solemn international pledges to promote the rehabilitation of Germany, not as a military State but as a peace-loving, democratic one, pledges which the three Powers made at the Potsdam Conference in 1945 and with which France later associated itself. Such a policy is not in the interests of peace, nor is it in the interests of the German, French or British peoples, or of any peace-loving people.

45. The Soviet Union is therefore categorically opposed to such a policy. It suggests a different course, consistent with the pledges the four Powers have made regarding Germany. It is a course which serves the interests of peace, and those of the German people and its neighbours, and of the peaceful and democratic development of the German State.

46. In March 1952, a year and a half ago, the Government of the Soviet Union submitted a draft to act as basis for the peace treaty with Germany, for consideration by the four Powers. The Governments of the

United States, the United Kingdom and France have still not presented their comments on this draft or their proposals in connexion with it. The three Western Powers are directing all their efforts to completing as speedily as possible the formation of the so-called European Defence Community and including in it the armed forces of Western Germany. But those who really desire a peaceful settlement of the German question are obliged to condemn and reject plans for the revival of militarism, which leads to war. That is a path down which military adventurers have repeatedly driven Germany, and twice in the last half-century they have brought the German people to national disaster. Now once again there is a question of committing Germany to military adventures.

47. The German Democratic Republic, which is the bulwark of the peace-loving forces of the whole of Germany, of the Germany of peace and labour, of democracy and progress, aims at securing peace for Germany and the creation of a single, independent, peace-loving and democratic Germany, an aim in which it has the support, far beyond its frontiers, of the broadest masses of the German people.

48. The Soviet Government's position as regards the plans contained in the Bonn, Paris and other agreements was made unequivocally clear when the German question first arose. In this connexion, it may be well to recall the words of the head of the Soviet Government which express the will and determination, not only of the entire Soviet people but of all peace-loving peoples, of all those who genuinely want peace and friendly relations among nations and who are against another world war. In his address before the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Mr. Malenkov said:

"They ask us to agree to the rebirth of an aggressive, militaristic Germany, and they dare at the same time to speak of ensuring peace in Europe. Yet millions of our sons and daughters have not shed their blood in the war against a militaristic Germany in order that this most dangerous breeding-ground of war in Europe should be restored. No, it was certainly not for that that we shed our blood in the great patriotic war!"

49. Germany's immediate neighbours, who have suffered terribly and more than once at the hands of the German militarists, are particularly concerned in a peaceful and enduring settlement of the German question. The German people also suffered cruelly at the hands of those militarists, and they have learned the lesson of their own history, which is that militarism leads to aggression and war, and to national suicide. That is why the best elements of the German people reject this course, and strive to ensure peace for Germany, and to achieve a single, independent, democratic and peace-loving Germany.

50. In connexion with the question of the rebirth of German militarism we must bear in mind the important consideration that the rearmament of Germany will, as is already being said, inevitably raise new problems which may strain to the limit the already overtaxed strength of allied unity. A rearmed and nationalistic Germany, *The New York Times* has said, could set off the spark of a war of capitalists against capitalists. Such are the dialectics of history, however much certain philosophers, politicians and diplomats may object to them.

51. It is no accident that the United States is encountering increasing resistance to the allocation of thousands of millions of dollars to military purposes and, in particular, to the so-called mutual security arrangements which, in fact, have nothing whatever to do with real security. At the same time, the expansion of trade is vital to the economy of many countries, as is shown by the widespread movement in the West in favour of the restoration of normal economic relations among nations and the expansion of trade.

52. Western Europe is going through a difficult time. Nobody is going to conceal this fact, and it would be useless to try to do so. This has been unanimously pointed out, for example, by the representatives of the business world at the Conference of the International Chamber of Commerce which met at Vienna in May and June 1953, and which was attended by over one thousand delegates from thirty-five countries. They all complained about the existing situation which, according to the report that appeared in the *Wall Street Journal*, they felt held little hope, particularly for any expansion of trade, in view of Western Europe's dependence on the United States, which is now greater than ever. It may be of some interest to note that, again according to the *Wall Street Journal*, the United States representative did everything in his power to dispel the fears prevailing at the conference by talking about the continuing prosperity in the United States, but the *Wall Street Journal* adds that his attempts were completely unsuccessful.

53. At the session of the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization which was held in April of this year, special emphasis was placed on the fact that—as the communiqué of the session put it—the main task was to ensure the simultaneous development of stable national economies on the one hand, and the growth of the armed forces of the bloc, on the other. Yet it must be clear to everyone, and experience has shown besides, that these two objectives are mutually exclusive. Experience has shown that either one of them excludes the other. You can either strengthen the national economy, in which case you must renounce an armaments race, or you can engage in an armaments race and not strengthen the national economy, unless, of course, the national economy is identified with the production of armaments, placing industry on a war footing, and similar measures.

54. The *Economic Survey of Europe since the War* [E/ECE/157], recently brought out by the Economic Commission for Europe, clearly shows the unsatisfactory economic situation of Western European countries. It is a heavy volume of several hundred pages which deals very fully with the question. Although it contains serious errors and a number of tendentious distortions of fact, the survey contains useful information which deserves our attention. Chapter 2, in particular the section headed "The division of Europe", is of special interest. It notes a number of important facts. In the first place, during the entire post-war period the world economy has undergone certain changes which, the survey admits, have had unfavourable effects on the countries of Western Europe. The second important observation, in my opinion, is that in the countries of Eastern Europe, including the USSR, the situation has been altogether different, as a result of which the losses of Western European countries have meant the gains of the Eastern European countries. A third point is that

the Eastern European countries, while able to avoid a number of problems connected with the control of private trade in the countries of Western Europe, have had the means—not available to the countries of Western Europe—of directly controlling their foreign commercial transactions with a view to balancing them. Fourthly, and lastly, the Eastern European countries—I am giving the survey's findings—have gained certain advantages as the suppliers of both agricultural and mining products to the countries of Western Europe.

55. Such is the economic situation in Eastern Europe and in Western Europe. It does not mean, of course, that Eastern Europe is not faced with difficulties. Tremendous problems, really gigantic problems, face the countries of Eastern Europe as a result of the radical transformation—I might say the radical revolution—of their national economies, and coping with such problems is not plain sailing.

56. It is clear from the survey that the measures taken against the economic interests of the USSR and the peoples' democracies, and in particular the economic blockade, far from fulfilling the expectations of the organizers of the blockade, have had the very opposite results. The economic blockade of the USSR, China and the peoples' democracies in Europe has merely caused those countries to close their ranks from the economic point of view and to organize their mutual co-operation and assistance. These conclusions are most important.

57. As regards the unfavourable changes in the world economy during the entire post-war period, which are also recognized by the survey brought out by the United Nations, these are the perfectly natural result of the policy pursued by such important countries as the United States, the United Kingdom, France and the other members of the North Atlantic bloc, a policy entirely dominated by military objectives which absorb the greater part of the national budgets of those countries. According to official figures, the current proportion of military expenditure of the total national budgets is as follows: United States, 73 per cent, United Kingdom, 42 per cent, and France, 33 per cent.

58. The Appropriations Committee of the United States Senate has approved a bill providing for the appropriation of \$34,500 million for military expenditure in 1954. To this amount must be added the unexpended appropriations from previous years which total close to \$100,000 million—either 91,000 or \$97,000 million, I am not sure of the exact amount. The very structure of the budgets evidences the fact that their chief purpose is to finance measures designed to put into effect plans of aggression. In his speech before the Chamber of Commerce at Minneapolis on 10 June of this year, the President of the United States confirmed that two out of every three dollars spent by the Federal Government were spent for military purposes. During the year 1952 to 1953, the military expenditure of the fourteen member countries of the North Atlantic bloc totalled \$63,000 million dollars as against \$18,000 million in 1950.

59. The enormous military expenditures were justified in the United States Senate Appropriations Committee on the grounds that without them the entire programme of mutual security would fail and that some countries of Western Europe, unable to bear the burden of military expenditure, might try—that was the official statement—to go their own way. This means that,

unable to bear the burden of military expenditures, they would in future refuse to take part in the military programme forced upon them for obviously aggressive purposes. Indeed, the tax burden of those countries has become excessive, particularly in recent years. In 1952, in the United States, 30 per cent of the national income was absorbed by taxes; in France, the figure was 39 per cent, and in the United Kingdom, 42 per cent. Indirect taxation, which, as is well known, is felt most by the broad masses of the population, reached 40 per cent in the United States, 44 per cent in the United Kingdom, 75 per cent in France, and 84 per cent in Italy.

60. The tax burden has grown to a point where many members of the United States Congress, according to recent reports in the United States Press, have been led to express the view that at the present level of military expenses, the United States will not be able to balance its budget without levying taxes which, in the view of some Senators, would amount to confiscation of property. A large part of the estimated funds is to be set aside for the expansion of existing military bases and the construction of new ones in foreign territory, and for the production of new weapons, including atomic and hydrogen bombs.

61. This question is always on the agenda of the General Assembly. Indeed, it is of tremendous importance. Yet instead of being stopped, the armaments race is continuing on an ever-increasing scale, and the weapons of mass destruction, as a result of the recent discoveries in the use of atomic energy for that purpose, are becoming ever more deadly and are threatening the lives of millions of people.

62. As regards military bases, their expansion can be seen from the fact that the United States now has a network of air bases alone which stretches over forty-nine countries, and that it keeps close to 2 million soldiers and members of the armed forces abroad, in twenty different countries.

63. The enormous military expenditures are increasingly necessitated by the armaments race which, while causing all peace-loving peoples literally to quake with fear, makes the United States monopolies hope that new streams of gold will flow into their pockets. As can be seen from the statistical data on this question, the profits of 416 United States monopolies were 25 per cent higher during the second quarter of 1953 than during the same quarter in 1952. At that, I am not certain that this figure is not lower than the actual amount, as is so often the case for such figures in view of all the various laws governing excess profits. These profits certainly encourage some influential circles including, and perhaps particularly, those of the United States, to continue and even to accelerate the armaments race. Yet the armaments race, as we noted before, is a heavy burden on the taxpayers, as the people usually suffer the consequences.

64. At this session, as at earlier ones, the General Assembly is faced with the vital question of adopting measures to avert the threat of a new world war and to reduce tension in international relations. It is not for the first time that the USSR delegation is putting before the General Assembly the question of measures designed to prevent the threat of a new world war.

65. My delegation pointed out at past sessions of the General Assembly that the United Nations must make a special effort to find a way out of the dangerous



situation into which the world had been placed as a result of the criminal plots of aggressive circles who gambled on war and who sought to aggravate international difficulties. We emphasized the need for taking every possible step to ensure international peace and security, and for putting an immediate end to the war which was forced upon the Korean people and which constitutes a threat of a new world war. We pressed for the immediate and unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon and the establishment of strict international control to ensure compliance with that prohibition. We pressed for the termination of the armaments race and of the construction of new military bases on foreign territory, and for the withdrawal of troops from foreign territories. We submitted those proposals to the General Assembly when the war in Korea was still in progress.

66. The opponents of our proposals, as recorded in the declaration of the United States, the United Kingdom and France, said that the programme for the reduction of armaments could not be carried into effect so long as the war in Korea continued, and that the war in Korea must be put to an end before there could be any reduction of armaments and armed forces. Thus it would seem that the war in Korea was an obstacle to such measures as the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of the atomic weapon. This is what we were told at General Assembly sessions in 1950, 1951 and 1952. Another prerequisite, we were told, was the lessening of international tension. The then United States Secretary of State made a statement in the General Assembly to the effect that there was a direct connexion between the possibility of achieving a system of disarmament and the international temperature. He said that the solution of the disarmament question would be possible only if there was a drop in the political temperature. What then are these conditions? The cessation of the war in Korea and a drop in the temperature. The first condition has been fulfilled. As for the second, the position is uncertain. At times the temperature may go down, and at times measures may be taken to bring it up. Yet both conditions are regarded as essential prerequisites for the adoption of any measures aimed at the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of the atomic weapon.

67. The present United States Secretary of State takes virtually the same position, stating that the problem of reducing armaments cannot be finally resolved in the prevailing atmosphere of distrust. That, incidentally, was also the line taken in 1928 by Mr. Paul-Boncour, the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the French Chamber of Deputies, when he uttered the well-known phrase: "First pacification, and then disarmament", although disarmament and the limitation of armaments are in themselves a means of strengthening of mutual trust. That fact, however, is disregarded. This was and still is the line taken by all the opponents of proposals for the reduction of armaments, the lessening of international tension, and the prevention of the threat of a new war. They have taken the opposite approach, that is to say, they made these measures conditional on an atmosphere of trust and calm, whereas these measures in themselves would help to increase trust and to promote calm by helping to lessen international tension.

68. The United States proposals on the reduction of armaments, submitted, as we all remember, by Mr.

Truman in 1951, were confined to such technical matters as an enumeration of military equipment, to be followed by various stages of so-called reduction of armaments, but there was in fact no question of any real reduction. Now, two years later, the United States delegation, as may be seen from Mr. Dulles' speech of 17 September, is again trying to confine the whole question to technical work, calling this a "technical analysis of the problem" of the reduction of armaments. Mr. Dulles, speaking about the United States proposals on the reduction of armaments, said that "they have laid the foundation for swift action once the general atmosphere makes this impossible". It is absolutely clear that the purpose of these already familiar provisos is to avoid taking measures directed towards the real reduction of armaments and armed forces.

69. There is no need to stress the fact that the United States proposals, with which we have already dealt at the previous session of the General Assembly, can in no way serve as a basis for the serious consideration and solution of the question of the reduction of armaments. This applies also to proposals on the question of the prohibition of atomic and other types of weapons destined for the mass destruction of people. Mr. Dulles preferred to be silent on this matter in his speech of 17 September, as if the problem did not exist. He merely said that physicists had found methods which, if developed further, could wipe life from the face of this planet and also that there was no problem comparable to the central and world-wide problem of saving the human race from extinction. If this is so, it would seem to be all the more necessary to submit to the Assembly a programme on this question, which would of course be much more important and useful than the dissemination here of all kinds of fabrications and fables hostile to the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies and the utterance of libellous statements.

70. The cessation of military activities in Korea is an important step towards relaxing tension in international relations. The conclusion of the truce in Korea has increased the certainty of millions and millions throughout the world that a peaceful settlement may be found not only of the Korean problem but also of other controversial and unresolved problems.

71. More propitious conditions are being created for the adoption of further measures to avert the threat of a new world war. These measures are essential. It is essential for the General Assembly to declare the unconditional prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other types of weapons of mass destruction.

72. The proposals which the United States and its partners have hitherto submitted in opposition to this demand of the Soviet Union have always brought us back to the Baruch Plan, which provides for no prohibition and is unacceptable to those who are really striving for the unconditional prohibition of atomic weapons and the establishment of real international control.

73. Because the Soviet Union has discovered the secret of the production of atomic and hydrogen weapons, certain members of the United States House of Representatives and Senate have called, according to the Press, for an intensification of the armaments race and, in particular, for the strengthening of the strategic air force.

74. As for the Soviet Union, it is appropriate to recall the government communiqué of 20 August concerning the hydrogen bomb tests in the Soviet Union and the TASS communiqué of 18 September on the tests of new types of atomic bombs in the Soviet Union.

75. The government communiqué stated:

"Certain foreign circles which formerly based their policy on the United States monopoly of the atomic bomb, and then of the hydrogen bomb, are trying to frighten the peoples by the fact that the Soviet Union has discovered the secret of the production of the hydrogen weapon, and thus to arouse alarm, which they will exploit to intensify the armaments race.

"The Government of the Soviet Union deems it necessary to declare that, as before, there is no basis whatsoever for such alarm.

"In accordance with the inflexible policy of the Soviet Union directed towards the strengthening of peace and the security of peoples, the Government of the Soviet Union has frequently proposed to the governments of other countries that they should carry out a considerable reduction of armaments and should prohibit the use of atomic and other weapons of mass destruction, establishing strict international control to ensure compliance with such prohibition within the framework of the United Nations.

"The Government of the Soviet Union steadfastly maintains this position."

The TASS communiqué of 18 September stated that in the preceding weeks, in accordance with plans for scientific research in atomic energy, several new types of atomic bombs had been tested in the Soviet Union. It stated, further:

"Obviously, as long as responsible circles in the United States reject the insistent proposals of the Soviet Union for the prohibition of the atomic weapon, the Soviet Union, for reasons of security, must give its attention to the production of atomic weapons. At the same time, the Soviet Union will continue to pursue its policy of strengthening peace among nations and will seek to reach agreement with other countries on the unconditional prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other types of weapons of mass destruction, the considerable reduction of armaments and the establishment of strict international control to ensure compliance with those decisions. At the same time, plans are being carried out in the Soviet Union for the use of atomic energy for industrial purposes. The Soviet Union considers its most important task to be that of ensuring that atomic energy is used to promote the cause of peaceful progress."

76. As may be seen from the preceding statements, the Soviet Union, having discovered the secret of the production of atomic and hydrogen weapons, continues to strive for agreement with other States concerning the unconditional prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other types of weapons of mass destruction, the considerable reduction of armaments and the establishment of strict international control.

77. At the same time, we consider it essential to draw the special attention of the Assembly to the unremit-

ting propaganda directed towards fomenting enmity and hatred among peoples and the preparation of a new world war. The heights of cynicism reached by this propaganda of hostility and hatred among nations may be judged from the statement made here by the Australian representative [436th meeting], who used a quotation fabricated by trouble-makers from the sayings of the great founder of the Soviet State, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. The words ascribed to Vladimir Ilyich Lenin in that so-called quotation represent an absolute bare-faced lie, since Lenin never said anything like that and of course could not have said anything like that.

78. In an article entitled "The Russian Revolution and the Civil War", published on 29 September 1917, Lenin wrote: "The odds are 99 to 100 that the victory of the proletarian revolution would result in peace instead of an imperialist war"; in other words, as Lenin wrote, such a victory would have saved the lives of hundreds of thousands of people, it would have saved the lives of half a million Russian soldiers who perished in the battles of 18 June 1917. Thus Lenin asserted that the victory of socialism in Russia at that time would save the lives of hundreds of thousands of people. He stressed that no bloodshed in a civil war could be even approximated to the seas of blood which the Russian imperialists shed after 18 June 1917, in the fourth year of an unprecedentedly cruel and criminal war which had exhausted the people, and in the offensive launched in June 1917 by the irresponsible Kerensky government. In an article entitled "The international position of the Russian Revolution", Lenin wrote in 1917 that if a just peace were proposed to the victors in the civil war—the Russian proletariat—the chances were 99 out of 100 in favour of an armistice and peace without the further shedding of seas of blood. That was what Lenin, the great leader of our people and of other peoples fighting for the brighter future of mankind, actually wrote. We were here presented with a monstrous alleged quotation by Mr. Casey. Lenin never said and could never have said any such thing. He wrote what I have just read.

79. The liberties taken by all kinds of rogues and trouble-makers cannot arouse wonder; that is why they are trouble-makers. It would seem, however, that there are representatives among us who do not hesitate to make use of the base fabrications which they have the temerity to bandy about in the United Nations. This is a further proof of the vile methods used by those who are conducting a propaganda of hostility and hatred against the Soviet Union, the peoples' democracies, the countries of socialist peace and international security. They stop at nothing.

80. This makes it the more essential decisively to censure the propaganda which is being conducted in certain countries, a propaganda directed towards inflaming hostility and hatred among nations and towards the preparation of a new world war, and to call upon all States to take measures to put a stop to such propaganda, as being incompatible with the fundamental principles and purposes of the United Nations. That is our second task.

81. The Soviet Union, considering that the establishment of military, air and naval bases in the territories of other States increases the threat of a new world war and undermines the national sovereignty and independence of those States, deems it essential

that steps should be taken to eliminate military bases on foreign territory. The Soviet Union considers this to be a matter of vital importance for the establishment of lasting peace and international security.

82. The Soviet Union again raises the question of the necessity of reducing armaments, declaring the unconditional prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other types of weapons of mass destruction, establishing strict international control, and instructing the Security Council to take immediate steps to prepare and implement an international agreement which would ensure the establishment of such control.

83. The USSR delegation therefore submits the following draft resolution to the General Assembly:

*"The General Assembly,*

*"Noting that the cessation of hostilities in Korea is an important contribution to the reduction of tension in international relations, and that it has created more favourable conditions for further action to avert the threat of a new world war,*

*"Noting, at the same time, that in a number of countries the armaments race, far from abating, is being continued on an even greater scale, and that weapons of mass destruction, as a result of the latest advances in the application of atomic energy for this purpose, are becoming ever more destructive and dangerous for many millions of people,*

*"With the object of averting the threat of a new world war and strengthening the peace and security of nations,*

*"1. Declares atomic, hydrogen and other types of weapons of mass destruction to be unconditionally prohibited, and instructs the Security Council to take immediate steps to prepare and implement an international agreement which will ensure the establishment of strict international control over the observance of this prohibition;*

*"2. Recommends to the five permanent members of the Security Council, the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, France and China, which bear the chief responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, that they reduce their armed forces by one-third within one year; and with a view to the alleviation of the burden of military expenditure recommends to the Security Council that it call as soon as possible an international conference for the carrying out by all States of the reduction of armaments;*

*"3. Recognizes that the establishment of military, air and naval bases in the territories of other States increases the threat of a new world war and operates to undermine the national sovereignty and independence of States;*

*"The General Assembly*

*"Recommends to the Security Council that it take steps to ensure the elimination of military bases in the territories of other States, considering this a matter of vital importance for the establishment of a stable peace and international security;*

*"4. Condemns the propaganda which is being conducted in a number of countries with the aim of inciting enmity and hatred among nations and preparing a new world war, and calls upon all governments to take measures to put a stop to such propa-*

*ganda, which is incompatible with the fundamental purposes and principles of the United Nations.<sup>1</sup>"*

84. The Soviet Union is deeply convinced that this is the real way not only to lower the temperature and lessen the tension in the international atmosphere but also to ensure peace and security for the peoples, enabling them to live on without fear or anxiety and to build their lives as they see fit, in accordance with their great sovereign rights as independent peoples. We sincerely hope that our appeal will meet with a widespread response, not only beyond the confines of this General Assembly, but among many delegations to this Assembly, and we call upon representatives to support our proposals, which are directed towards the strengthening of peace and international security.

85. Mr. COOPER (Liberia): As we commence this session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, despite our pious hopes, we have seen no relaxation of world tension. Much as we are gratified over the armistice in Korea, the political horizon still casts a shadow of pending gloom and destruction. To paraphrase the poet, "humanity with all its fears, with all its hopes for future years, still hangs breathlessly on thy fate". What shall be that fate? Shall it be peace with plenty? Shall it be peace according to the Charter, devoid of all fear, of all oppression, of all poverty and of all disease; where the rights and liberties of each individual and the safety of each nation are guaranteed and respected by small nations and the great Powers alike? Or shall we be the victims of our own folly and greed, which with our rapid burrowing into the secrets of nature have assured our own total destruction?

86. Our only hope can be the success of the United Nations. Through the ages, we—as the savage, the barbarian or the modern, cultured gentleman—have developed no other remedy for settling our differences and grievances than congregating around a conference table, whether that table has stood outdoors in the shade of an oak or a palm, in the splendid palaces of the learned and cultured, or in the bare hut of the simple peasant. God has endowed man with a mind, with a tongue and with the power of reasoning. It is these assets—if he cares to use them—that distinguish man from the beasts of the jungle where the right of survival depends upon the strength of the great.

87. To many it must appear that, as man advances in science and learning, he declines at the same pace in his moral conception of right, justice and the simple principles of honesty and fair play towards his fellow man; there seems to be no equal balance in the scale between his material wants and necessities and his moral rectitude, because his desires for the riches of the world are stimulated according to his cravings, which, through science, have brought him all the

<sup>1</sup> This draft resolution, reproduced as document A/2485/Rev.1, was accompanied by a letter dated 21 September 1953 from the Chairman of the USSR delegation, Mr. Vyshinsky, to the President of the General Assembly, which read as follows:

"I have the honour to submit herewith for inclusion in the agenda of the eighth session of the United Nations General Assembly the important and urgent item:

"Measures to avert the threat of a new world war and to reduce tension in international relations".

"I should be grateful if you would arrange for the attached draft resolution on this item to be distributed as a General Assembly document."

The item was included in the agenda as item 73.

luxuries and conveniences of life. Basking in a state of contentment, man is unmindful of his duty towards his fellow man, which, by the moral code, is to "do unto others as you would have them do unto you".

88. Through this Organization, we have been endeavouring, with some remarkable degree of success, to bring to the less fortunate of our fellow-beings the blessings of the prosperous world—by food through the FAO [*Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations*], health through the WHO [*World Health Organization*], education and science through UNESCO [*United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization*]. But, we wonder, to what avail all this if our struggles through the years to improve and help the less fortunate are to be wiped away overnight by our failures in the political and diplomatic fields to redress our wrongs and to settle our differences? It would be tantamount to fattening the ox before its execution in the arena.

89. Wars have accomplished nothing. To the victors they have brought vain glory, pride and loot, gathered from triumphs that have eventually ended in man's own destruction. Luxury and comfort beget decadence, decadence generally leads to depravity and softness, and the victor of battle becomes the victim of his own lust. To the vanquished, defeat brings bitterness and kindles the flame of vengeance.

90. As long as man seeks to prey upon man; as long as the individual attempts to exploit the weaknesses and ignorance of his neighbour; as long as the blessings of the universe are not apportioned upon the principle of share and share alike but upon the lion's policy of strength; as long as the precept of freedom is interpreted in defiance of the moral code that man, made in the image of his Maker, is fully entitled to a share in the yield of the earth; as long as justice is meted out on the basis of skin pigmentation, physical structure or geographical situation, all our gestures of assistance will make no difference, and we shall be bound to have clashes among individuals, nations, races.

91. Today we live in two distinct worlds: the communistic world, with its many democratic republics, and the Western world, with its broad democracies. What would impress one coming from a world foreign to our own is that the chief aims of both these worlds appear to be identical, the ostensible aims being the safeguarding of the rights and privileges of the individual. This identity is illustrated by the terms used by the two types of governments when they style themselves "peoples' democratic governments" in the East, on the one hand, and "Western democracies" on the other. What is the reason, what is the purpose, when both sides use the selfsame word, "democracy", and then charge each other with fraud and deceit for using such a term; when each accuses the other of suppression and exploitation of the individual—acts which this symbol, "democracy", certainly precludes? The reason must be the one which has been well learned through the ages: that no government, no people, no race will continue to live which lives on suppression or the denial of the rights of life, liberty and property to the individual. No State can long thrive that thrives upon the misery and poverty of the weak.

92. The world is troubled not by the doctrines we expound, but rather by the way we apply those doctrines, whether they be communistic or democratic. The proof of the pudding, after all, is in the eating.

As the poet, Burns, said: "Oh that God the gift would give us, to see ourselves as others see us." It is therefore interesting and amusing to those not directly involved, and on the other hand perhaps alarming to those who are in the forefront of the struggle of East versus West, that each side finds among its own citizens advocates and followers of the doctrines of its opponent. These dissents are generally not based upon any settled principle, either communistic in origin or democratic in form; they are simply precipitated by the aspirations of the individual for the rights and privileges which are due to him by his Maker, and which he feels are being denied him by somebody.

93. We deceive ourselves into believing ourselves infallibly right and our opponents unfailingly wrong. It is this deception, nurtured to soothe our guilty conduct, that breeds the suspicion and distrust that we have for each other. So intense and alive has become this feeling of mistrust, that our entire outlook on world problems is based on what we see through the narrow end of a telescope of apprehension and fear—and it is this outlook which has made it impossible for us in this Assembly to assess honestly one another's proposals for the settlement of disputes, despite the genuineness and sincerity of such proposals. We have come to believe that behind the hand of friendship must necessarily lurk the danger of destruction.

94. There may be grounds for suspicion. True is the proverb that, "once bitten, twice shy", and we are constantly verifying that adage by quoting the notorious Munich Agreement. Humanity would be lost if God condemned the whole human race simply because one individual was found to be wrong. If we persist in trying to settle our differences on the basis of the Munich Agreement, we shall accomplish nothing, and our fear and distrust will eventually involve us in another catastrophe, which may end our civilization. The purpose for which this Organization was founded would therefore have been defeated, and the United Nations would become simply a rostrum for world propaganda, exploited by each side for its own use and convenience.

95. Men through the ages have formed themselves into clans, tribes, and eventually nations, for the better protection of themselves. With the advance of culture, nations, like individuals, have bound themselves together, by treaties or tacit understandings, into alliances, groups and blocs. The excuse given for such arrangements has been that of self-protection, which precept has become famous in history as the policy of the balance of power. It was hoped by such geographical grouping or racial combining or the merging of self-interests that nations would be deterred from attacking each other. But this form of alliance has not been able to check wars; it has rather accelerated the conflicts among nations. We witnessed the failure of the regional groups in the Great War of 1914-18 between the Triple Alliance and the *Entente Cordiale*. We saw similar unhappy examples in the Second World War between the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis and the Allies. It must be because of our disappointment in such pacts that we were finally led to form this Organization, known as the United Nations, which would in itself make these alliances useless and unnecessary.

96. Despite our tragic experiences in the past, our prejudices and misgivings about each other have been so tenacious that we have not been able to shed them,

and have thus brought with us into this Organization all the old complaints and illnesses of our world of yesterday. The United Nations has shattered itself into fragments which have become labelled: the Communist bloc, or Iron Curtain countries; the Western bloc, or NATO [*North Atlantic Treaty Organization*] countries; the Latin-American bloc; the Middle-Eastern bloc; and the Asian-African bloc. With the coming of years, conflicting interests and the admission of new Members with different ideologies, we are apt to see many more groups of this kind.

97. This brings to memory a joke that was circulated in Germany during the Hitler régime. It was stated that the notorious Dr. Ley, the German Minister of Labour, visited the port of Hamburg for the purpose of addressing the workers of the great shipyard of Blom and Voss. In his address, he inquired how many workers present belonged to the Communist Party. He was told 40 per cent. He then asked how many workers belonged to the Socialist Party. He was told 30 per cent. He then asked how many belonged to the Christian Democratic Party. He was told another 30 per cent. From this reckoning, Dr. Ley figured that none of the labourers belonged to his own party. With some degree of hesitation he finally asked how many workers belonged to the Nazi Party. He received a shock at the reply that they were all Nazis. This appears to be the state in the United Nations today. The fragments or splinter groups, though part of the whole, have not tended to strengthen this Organization. It has therefore become clear to all the world that when a major decision is to be taken by the United Nations, concerted action will not follow, as each group views the situation in the light of its own interests and gives its support according to its own conception of right and wrong.

98. The doctrine of the master race, enunciated by Hitler, and the cry for *Lebensraum* used by the Nazis

in their world propaganda, brought into focus the present-day clash of colour and the awakening of the national aspirations of the peoples of Asia and Africa. The theories and policies of the Nazi régime seem to have worked in reverse; notably in Asia, where the shackles of bondage and the stigma of colour have been forced to give way to the surge of nationalism which is today a reality in the new States of the East.

99. It was bound to follow that such outbursts of national aspirations could not be confined to a particular race or to a particular zone or hemisphere—that the rhythm would eventually be picked up in those parts of the world and among those races of mankind that were still subjected to oppression and intimidation. This rising tide of demand for self-determination and independence, spreading from the East, now beats upon the shores and seeps its way into the innermost part of that continent once known as Darkest Africa. It cannot be arrested. It might be temporarily checked, but it will eventually drive all obstacles from its way.

100. We, as Liberians, whose existence was brought into being through grinding oppression, cannot be indifferent to and uninterested in the cry of our brethren in Africa—whether this be from the East or West, North or South, or any portion of the universe. We have known the pains of oppression and the stigma of colour, and we owe it to our national self-respect, to our race, to our continent, to our fellow Africans and to mankind itself to lend an ear to the plaintive cries for freedom and to give all the support we can to the aspirations of those people whose only wish is to be free men and masters of their own destinies. No coercion or intimidation, no promises or cajolery will deter us in this cause.

*The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.*