

September 18, 1947

**Text of Speech Delivered by A.Y. Vyshinsky at the
General Assembly of the United Nations, September
18, 1947**

Citation:

"Text of Speech Delivered by A.Y. Vyshinsky at the General Assembly of the United Nations, September 18, 1947", September 18, 1947, Wilson Center Digital Archive, For the Peace and Friendship of Nations, against the Instigators of a New War: Text of Speech Delivered by A.Y. Vyshinsky at the General Assembly of the United Nations, September 18, 1947 (Washington, DC: Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 1947). <https://wilson-center.drivingcreative.com/document/220070>

Summary:

The Soviet Union's response to George Marshall's September 17, 1947, speech at the UNGA. Vyshinsky offers the Soviet Union's position on arms control, nuclear weapons, the UN, Korea, Greece, and other issues raised by Marshall

Original Language:

English

Contents:

Original Scan

Translation - English




Text of Speech Delivered by

A. Y. VYSHINSKY

**For the Peace and Friendship of Nations,
Against the Instigators of a New War**

at the General Assembly of the United Nations

September 18, 1947



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
Columbia University Libraries

**FOR THE PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP OF
NATIONS, AGAINST THE INSTIGATORS
OF A NEW WAR**

Speech Delivered By

A. Y. VYSHINSKY

*Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs
of the USSR, Chairman of the USSR
Delegation to the Second Session of
the General Assembly of the United
Nations*

at the

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS
NEW YORK CITY
September 18, 1947**



JAN 8 1948

Published by
The Embassy of the Union of Soviet
Socialist Republics
at 2016 Wyoming Avenue, N. W., Washington 9, D. C.
September, 1947

Mr. Chairman, Fellow Delegates:

A YEAR has passed since the First Session of the General Assembly. It is necessary to cast a retrospective glance on the road traversed, and to make an analysis of the work performed during this time by the Organization of the United Nations, to summarize certain results, and to outline possible perspectives.

Each delegation, each member state of the Organization of the United Nations has the duty to perform its obligations in an unprejudiced manner and with consciousness of its high responsibility in this matter, which requires complete clarity, objectivity, and respect for truth, which must be placed above all else.

Casting its retrospective glance, the Soviet Union delegation must note that during the period covered by the Report there were serious setbacks in the activity of the United Nations. These setbacks should be disclosed and identified with all determination and consistency. They have been expressed mainly in a departure from the most important principle on which this Organization is founded, and also, in some cases, in a direct violation of a number of important decisions of the General Assembly. These setbacks have been, to a large extent, the result of a tendency on the part of such influential members of the United Nations as the United States of America, and also the United Kingdom, to utilize the Organization in the interests of their small group, without any regard for international cooperation on the basis of the principles set forth in the Charter.

The policy of individual states in using this Organization for the purpose of achieving their own selfish and narrowly conceived interests leads to the undermining of the Organization's prestige,

just as took place in the case of the League of Nations of grievous memory.

On the other hand, the unsatisfactory state of affairs in the United Nations Organization, which has a telling negative effect upon its prestige, is a result of ignoring the Organization of the United Nations by the states mentioned above, which are attempting to carry out a number of practical measures outside the framework of the United Nations and with a lack of due regard for it.

It is necessary to draw serious attention to the menace thus created to the United Nations Organization by such a policy, which is incompatible with the principles of the Charter and with the aims and purposes contemplated by the United Nations when they established the Organization.

I

The U. S. A. and Great Britain Are Opposed to the Reduction of Armaments

AMONG the most important setbacks in the activities of the United Nations Organization, one should mention, in the first place, the unsatisfactory fulfillment of the Assembly's decision of December 14, 1946, with regard to the universal reduction of armaments. The resolution on the universal reduction of armaments, which was passed unanimously by the General Assembly, corresponds to the vital interest of millions of people who, in spite of the termination of the Second World War, still shoulder the burdens of military expenses and those connected with the unceasing increase of armaments.

The decision on the universal reduction of armaments, which was adopted by the Assembly, is at the same time an expression of the aspirations and demands of the peace-loving nations for the establishment of a durable peace and of international security as well as an expression of demands dictated by the sufferings which those nations experienced during the war and the sacrifices they

made. For this particular reason, the above-mentioned decision met the profound approval of the peoples of the whole world, and they hoped for its rapid and complete fulfillment and realization. However, these hopes were not realized.

The representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom, at the time attempts were being made to outline within the framework of the Security Council and the Commission of Conventional Armaments practical measures for the realization of the General Assembly's decision on the universal regulation and reduction of armaments, proposed such terms for the reduction of armaments as could only result in failure to realize the above-mentioned decision of the Assembly. The whole activity of the United States and United Kingdom delegations in the Commission for Conventional Armaments testifies to the fact that the United States and the United Kingdom are unwilling to disarm and that they are putting a brake on the realization of disarmament, which gives reason for anxiety among the peace-loving nations of the world.

The statement of Mr. Bevin, made in Southport, to the effect that he was not going to further disarmament, serves as a convincing answer to the question about the reasons for the unsatisfactory state of affairs with regard to the realization of the Assembly's decision on the reduction of armaments. The recent statement by the President of the United States, Mr. Truman, in Petropolis, in which the President emphasized that the United States military forces are to be maintained, while saying not a single word about the obligation to make a reduction of armed forces assumed by the United Nations in accordance with the General Assembly's decisions, speaks of the same.

Such a position taken by the United States of America and Great Britain with regard to the reduction of armaments and the absence of positive results in the solving of problems indicated in the resolution of December 14, 1946, gives rise, as we have mentioned, to justified apprehension and alarm with regard to the possibility of successfully completing the undertaken task; the speed-up of armaments, atomic weapons included, and military preparations of some military and economically powerful states

particularly promote the spreading of the feeling of alarm and anxiety. This undermines the faith in the sincerity of peaceful declarations and statements on the determination to make future generations free from the hardships and horrors of war.

II

The United States of America Disrupts the Outlawing of Atomic Weapons

THE unsatisfactory state of affairs with regard to the outlawing of atomic and other principal types of weapons of mass extermination gives rise to particular anxiety on the part of millions of common people. The anxiety is all the more justified for the reason that atomic weapons are weapons of attack and aggression. After one and a half years of work by the Atomic Energy Commission, none of the tasks set before it by the General Assembly's resolution of January 24, 1946, has been completed, nor has there been the slightest progress in the fulfillment of those tasks.

The Soviet Government, for its part, undertook a number of steps with a view to contributing to the positive solution of this question. In addition to and in furtherance of its own proposal concerning the conclusion of an international convention for outlawing atomic and other principal types of weapons of mass extermination, the Soviet Government submitted for the consideration of the Atomic Energy Commission a proposal dealing with the principal provisions for international control over atomic energy. Nevertheless that proposal met with resistance, mainly on the part of the United States of America. The United States of America, believing that it will continue to exercise a monopoly with regard to atomic weapons, resists any attempts to dismantle the existing stock of atomic bombs and outlaw their further production. At the same time the United States of America systematically increases the production of such bombs. The disagreement among the Commission members in this respect hinders the work of the Commission and paralyzes all efforts directed to the successful solution of the task set before the Commission,

At the same time there is no doubt whatever that many of these disagreements could have been eliminated, provided there had been displayed a more objective approach to the question on the part of some delegations, the American delegation included. For instance, it could have been possible to eliminate the disagreement that arose in connection with the Soviet delegation's proposal on destruction of atomic bomb stocks upon the coming into force of the convention outlawing atomic weapons. As is known, the majority in the Commission agreed in principle that it is necessary to destroy the stock of atomic weapons and use their nuclear energy only for peaceful aims. Only one delegation, to wit, the delegation of the United States of America, continues to object to the destruction of the stock of atomic bombs, thus obstructing a decision on the question approved by the majority of the Commission.

One's attention is attracted by the situation that has been created with regard to the question of inspection. The American delegation previously was stressing the particular significance of inspection. In the Soviet delegation's proposals inspection also is the main issue after the outlawing of atomic weapons.

At present, the American delegation has unexpectedly begun to lessen the importance of inspection, putting into first place other questions, such as the transfer of atomic enterprises to the ownership of an international body, management, issuance of licenses and so forth. At the same time, the American delegation does not want the opinions of authoritative men of science to be taken into account. For instance, in the memorandum of the British Council of Atomic Scientists Association, which includes such prominent scientists as Rudolf Peierls, Oliphant, Moon and others, that memorandum objects to the ownership of the means of production of atomic energy by an international control body. As is known, the British scientists emphasize in this memorandum that transfer to this international control body of the means of production "into its full ownership, in the usual sense of this word, would give rise to difficulties, since this ownership would give the control body the right to decide whether this or that country is entitled to construct atomic energy plants and the right to prevent the use of

energy manufactured by such plants and to set the terms for supplying such energy."

The British scientists, criticizing the thesis defended by the American delegation since the time of Mr. Baruch's activity, justly state: "Such a restriction would make it possible to intervene in the economic life of each country to an extent not necessary for preventing the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes." This is the voice of men of science who consider this problem from the point of view of the interests of scientific progress, which is incompatible with unrestricted control exercised by some centralized international body over scientific and research work directed at the achievement of peaceful aims of discoveries and increase of energy resources.

This is why the memorandum of the British scientists—which I have cited—actually speaks in favor of the plan that would provide a guarantee against accumulation of dangerous materials without the sanction of the organs for atomic energy control and would give all the nations, at the same time, the possibility of initiating construction on their territory of plants producing atomic energy in addition to other energy resources on those territories.

III

The USSR is for the Outlawing of Atomic Weapons, for Strict International Control

THE Soviet Union proposed in the interests of universal peace to conclude a convention outlawing the use of atomic weapons in all circumstances whatever. This proposal made by the Soviet Union found a warm response and support in all countries. "Such a convention," says the memorandum of the British Association of Scientific Workers, "appears to us to be highly desirable, and it is difficult to justify the reluctance on the part of the United Kingdom and the United States of America to agree to it." The British scientists, evaluating the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics' demand to destroy the stock of atomic

weapons and cease the production of new ones, write that such a provision appears to be eminently reasonable.

The Soviet Union stands for strict international control over atomic energy plants but such control, however, which should not be transformed into interference with those branches of national industry and with those questions that are not connected with atomic energy. Here again, the British atomic scientists are right, because in the memorandum covered on January 23 of this year they state "that the right of inspection should be limited as far as possible and should not serve to satisfy excessive curiosity with regard to legitimate industry and other forms of activity."

The British scientists in this memorandum published in August, 1947, once more point to the necessity of restricting to certain limits the rights of inspection, which should not serve the aims of organized economic and military espionage. The memorandum states: "The United States and other supporters of the Baruch plan should be encouraged to formulate safeguards to ensure that any inspection scheme should not develop into an elaborate system of espionage."

Proceeding from the principles outlined above of the establishment of international control which should be, we repeat, real, strong and effective, the Soviet delegation believes it necessary to put the inspection authorities within certain limits, to restrict their rights to the aims of genuine control over atomic energy, excluding the possibility of the use of the control authorities for arbitrary intervention in any branches of the national economy of any country, not considering the fact that such intervention can only undermine and destroy the national economy of any country. The United States delegation and some other delegations who support it insist particularly that the international control authority, transformed into an owner and acting accordingly in the interests of the majority of this authority, on whose benevolent attitude the Soviet Union cannot count (*Laughter*) should own and manage all plants manufacturing atomic materials in a dangerous quantity. And the delegations that group around the United States delegation and act under its leadership try

to achieve exactly such a situation. The previously quoted memorandum of the British scientists does not conceal the fact that the United States plan for the organization of control over atomic energy provides for measures which, as stated in the memorandum, "can be interpreted as a support of the United States dominance in the province of atomic energy . . ."

The Soviet delegation is opposed to such a thesis and will remain opposed to it in future, trying to achieve not the dominance of a single nation in the international control body but equality of all participants in this body in all its activities.

It should be recalled in this connection that the United States representatives on the Atomic Energy Commission stubbornly oppose the simultaneous establishment of control over atomic industry in all its stages, from the extraction of raw material up to the output of finished products.

The United States representatives propose to postpone indefinitely the establishment of control over the most dangerous final stages of atomic manufacturing, stages in which the United States considers itself at the present time to be holding a monopoly. At the same time, the United States insists that control over the initial stage—extraction of the raw material—should be immediately introduced. It is abundantly clear that the American position cannot be otherwise interpreted but as a position according to which control is not to be extended to the United States of America while all other countries should immediately come under international control. (*Applause.*)

Such is the state of affairs with regard to the atomic question.

Naturally, one cannot expect successful results from work in which there is shown on the part of some delegations no intention to cooperate for the purpose of achieving the aims stated in the General Assembly's resolution of December 14, 1946. Such a situation cannot be tolerated. One cannot reconcile oneself to the fact that the threat of the use of atomic energy for the purposes of mass destruction and extermination of peaceful populations is not yet eliminated. The conscience of the nations cannot tolerate such a state of affairs when, notwithstanding the appeal of the United Nations Organization to eliminate atomic

weapons and other principal types of means of mass extermination of human beings, the manufacturing of such means not only continues but even increases more and more.

IV

The Plans of Truman and Marshall are not Compatible with the Principles of the United Nations Organization

THE so-called "Truman Doctrine" and "Marshall Plan" are particularly striking instances of the violation of the principles of the United Nations Organization, and of the ignoring of the Organization. (*Applause.*)

The experience of the past few months has proved that the proclamation of this doctrine meant that the United States Government openly gave up the principles of international cooperation and concerted action of the great powers, and passed to attempts to dictate its will to other independent nations, utilizing at the same time the economic means allotted as relief for individual countries in need for open political pressure. This has been sufficiently illustrated by the measures undertaken by the United States Government in Greece and Turkey outside the framework of the United Nations Organization, and in evasion of it, as well as by the measures planned for Europe in accordance with the so-called "Marshall Plan." This policy is in deep contradiction to the principle proclaimed by the General Assembly in its resolution of December 11, 1946, that assistance to other countries "should never be used as a political weapon."

The "Marshall Plan" is in fact, as it is perfectly clear now, only another version of the "Truman Doctrine" adjusted to the conditions of postwar Europe. The United States Government, when putting forward this "Plan," apparently expected, with the cooperation of the British and French Governments, to make the European countries that are in need of relief face the necessity of giving up their inalienable rights to dispose of their own economic resources, to plan their own national economy as

they see fit, just as the United States Government expected to make all those countries directly dependent on the interests of American monopolies which are seeking to avoid the impending crisis by accelerated export to Europe of accumulated commodities and capital.

As is known, not all the European countries, despite their needs and the difficulties of the postwar economic rehabilitation period, agree to such an infringement of their sovereignty and to such interference in their internal affairs; while on the other hand, the countries which did consent to take part in the negotiations on this subject at the Paris Conference understand more and more the dangers of their position and the true meaning of this offer of assistance or relief. It is becoming more clear to everybody that the implementation of the "Marshall Plan" would mean the subjugation of European countries to economic and political control exercised by the United States of America, and direct interference on its part in the internal affairs of those countries.

At the same time this "Plan" is an attempt to break Europe into two camps and to complete, with the assistance of the United Kingdom and France, the formation of a bloc of a number of European countries, hostile to the interests of the democratic states of Eastern Europe, and first of all, to the interests of the Soviet Union. The tendency to set up a bloc of a number of Western European countries, Western Germany included, as against the countries of Eastern Europe is an important feature of this "Plan." At the same time, it is intended to use Western Germany and German heavy industry (the Ruhr) as one of the principal economic bases for United States expansion in Europe, in spite of the national interests of the countries which have been victims of German aggression.

It suffices to recall these facts to show indisputably the full incompatibility of such a policy of the United States as well as the policies of the French and United Kingdom Governments which support the United States, with the basic principles of the United Nations Organization.

The Violations of the United Nations Organization's Decisions

NEITHER can one consider as normal such a situation with regard to the relations among the members of the United Nations Organization where foreign armed forces continue to remain on the territories of the members of the Organization, such armed forces being instruments of political interference in their internal affairs and thus creating unequal and subordinate relations among the states, contradictory to the Charter. British troops still remain in Egypt against the will of that country. Troops still remain in Greece in violation of her State Constitution, and in Transjordan which applied for membership in the United Nations. United States troops continue to remain in China. This by no means contributes to the establishment of internal peace in that country. The presence of foreign troops on the territory of non-enemy states should not take place unless such presence is connected with the protection of communications with ex-enemy territories during their occupation. The strengthening of universal peace and mutual confidence among the nations demands an urgent and positive solution of the question of the evacuation from the territories of the non-enemy states of foreign troops when they are not engaged in guarding the communications of their countries with former enemy states.

One should point out also the failure on the part of some members of the Organization to put into effect important decisions of the Assembly: on the Spanish question (Argentina); on the question of discrimination against Indians in South Africa, and the establishment of a trusteeship over the former mandated territory of Southwest Africa (Union of South Africa).

The General Assembly cannot pass by such actions of some individual members of the Organization who disrupt the achievement of the aims set out by the decisions of the Assembly, and who weaken the prestige of the United Nations Organization.

In this connection, we cannot but dwell on the developments which have taken place in Indonesia. These events cannot be

qualified otherwise than as an act of aggression perpetrated against the people of Indonesia by a member state of the United Nations. The unprovoked military attack by the Netherlands against the Indonesian Republic has caused the justified indignation of all honest people throughout the world. (*Applause.*) Well, did the United Nations render due assistance and defense to the Indonesian people? We all know that this was not the case. As the result of the consideration of the Indonesian question by the Security Council, certain states made no small effort to minimize the importance and significance of developments in Indonesia, and made no small effort to foist upon the Security Council a decision which can by no means be regarded as sufficient to protect the legitimate interests of the Indonesian Republic, which has become a victim of military attack. It is clear that such decisions cannot but undermine the prestige of the United Nations, which is specifically called upon to secure the maintenance of peace among the nations.

At the same time, one's attention is attracted by the fact that while not showing due interest in the elimination of the unsatisfactory state of affairs with regard to the solution of the Spanish and other questions which I have just cited, some influential powers display a particular interest in the Iranian question, which still remains on the agenda of the Security Council, notwithstanding the fact that 18 months have already passed since its complete settlement, and in spite of the request of Iran itself to take this question off the agenda of the Security Council.

It is really worth noting how the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom doggedly try to keep the Iranian question on the agenda of the Security Council at any cost and against any reasoning, for some apparently specific purposes. The extraordinary doggedness displayed in this respect by the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom on the Security Council is all the more worthy of one's attention, because this doggedness has remained unshaken even after a well-grounded clarification was made by the Secretary General

to the effect that there are no reasons for the Security Council to deal with the so-called Iranian question.

Touching upon the subject of the Trusteeship Council, the Soviet Union delegation also considers it necessary to note the following:

At the meeting of the General Assembly of December 13, 1946, the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics criticized the agreements on trusteeship over the ex-mandated territories submitted for the approval of the Assembly, for the reason that the very preparation of those agreements and some of their articles did not correspond to what was required by the appropriate Articles of the Charter of the United Nations. The establishment of the Trusteeship Council was based on the said agreements with the above-mentioned setbacks, and this, naturally, could not but influence the Soviet Union delegation's attitude toward the election of the members of the Council. The Soviet Union delegation still continues to maintain the views stated in this respect by the Soviet Union delegation at the meeting of the General Assembly on December 13, 1946.

The Soviet Union delegation, representing a state which is a permanent member of the Trusteeship Council, wishes to express the hope that the above-mentioned violations of the Charter that took place at the time the agreements on trusteeship were concluded will be corrected, which would undoubtedly facilitate the execution by the Trusteeship Council of its tasks.

It goes without saying that this would serve the interests of both the United Nations Organization as a whole and the interests of the population of the trustee territories.

The unsatisfactory state of affairs with regard to the work of the United Nations Organization is not an accident, but it is a direct result of an attitude toward the Organization on the part of a number of member nations of the Organization, particularly the United States and the United Kingdom. Such an attitude does not facilitate or further the strengthening of the Organization and does not serve the cause of international cooperation. On the contrary, such an attitude leads to the weakening and instability of the United Nations Organization,

which undoubtedly is in keeping with the plans and intentions of reactionary elements in the above-mentioned countries, under whose interests a suitable policy is now being carried out.

VI

The USSR is for the Strengthening of the United Nations Organization

As regards the Soviet Union, its policy with regard to the United Nations Organization is a policy of strengthening the Organization; it is a policy of broadening and strengthening international cooperation; a policy of steady, consistent observance of the Charter and of the implementation and fulfillment of its principles.

The strengthening of the United Nations Organization is only possible on the basis of a respectful attitude toward the political and economic independence of nations, on the basis of a respectful attitude toward the sovereign equality of nations, as well as of a consistent and unconditional observance of one of the most important principles of the United Nations Organization, that is, the principle of unanimity and accord among the great powers in making decisions on the most important problems dealing with the maintenance of international peace and security. This is in full accord with the special responsibility of these powers for the maintenance of universal peace, and is a guarantee of the protection of the interests of all the members of the United Nations Organization, great and small.

The Soviet Union feels that it is its duty to struggle resolutely against any attempts to shake this principle, no matter under what motives or guises these attempts might be made.

It is only left for me to say a few words with regard to the address of the Honorable Secretary of State of the United States of America, Mr. Marshall. In that statement, questions were dealt with which have repeatedly been dealt with before. Most of these questions are included on the agenda of the General Assembly as separate paragraphs, which means that we shall

have an opportunity to state our opinion on them at the proper place and at the proper time when they are taken up.

Mr. Marshall's address, however, also raised some other questions.

The Soviet Union delegation considers it essential here and now to dwell upon a few of those questions which were touched upon by Mr. Marshall; the question, for instance, of the threat to the independence and territorial integrity of Greece. Leaving the discussion of this question at proper length until the time when the General Assembly deals with it according to the adopted agenda, the Soviet Union delegation feels it necessary to state only that the very raising of this question is devoid of any foundation whatever. The charges leveled by the United States delegation against Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania are utterly arbitrary and without any proof. These charges go much further than the conclusions of the majority of the Commission, which were not supported by almost one half of the members of that Commission and which do not stand criticism if one is to take any serious approach to the data on which the conclusions are based. It will not be difficult to prove that the so-called Report of the Balkan Investigating Commission is full of contradictions and gross exaggerations which deprive its conclusions of any importance or significance whatsoever.

Now, as to the question of Korea. Having arbitrarily outlined the situation in such a way that the futility of the work of the Soviet-American Commission on Korea is attributed to the Soviet Union, Mr. Marshall makes a proposal which is in direct violation of the Moscow Agreement on Korea reached by the Foreign Ministers in December, 1945. According to this Agreement, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics undertook the responsibility of preparing a joint solution to the problem of the unification of Korea into one independent democratic state. The new proposal made by Mr. Marshall is a violation of the obligations assumed by the United States of America, and for that reason is not right or acceptable. The United States Government, instead of undertaking arrangements for carrying out adopted measures according to the Moscow

Agreement on Korea in December, 1945, and submitting them to the consideration of the Governments of the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and China, prefers to violate its undertakings by attempting to conceal, under the prestige of the General Assembly, its own unilateral and completely unjustifiable actions. The Soviet Government cannot accept such a violation of the agreement on Korea and will insist that the proposal made by Mr. Marshall be rejected for the reason that it is contrary to the obligations assumed under the tripartite agreement by the three powers on Korea.

Now, as to the question of the Interim Committee. Mr. Marshall proposes the establishment of a Standing Committee of the General Assembly under the title of the "Interim Committee on Peace and Security," which would pay constant attention to the work of the General Assembly and its continuing problems. In spite of the reservations in the United States proposal to the effect that the Committee would not impinge on matters which are the primary responsibility of the Security Council or its special commissions, there is not the slightest doubt that the attempt to create an Interim Committee is nothing but a badly concealed scheme to substitute for and to bypass the Security Council. The functions of this Committee, whose task it would be to consider "situations and disputes that impair friendly relations" among nations, are nothing more than the functions of the Security Council as provided for by Article 34 of the Charter. Even by virtue of this situation alone these functions cannot be transferred to any other organ, no matter what its name is, without obvious and direct violation of the Charter of the United Nations; and of course the Soviet Delegation can in no way accept it and will energetically oppose it. (*Applause.*)

I repeat that, if the above-mentioned new proposals, as well as the old ones in a new form, are submitted to the General Assembly by the United States delegation, the Soviet Union delegation reserves its right to make a more detailed and more elaborate analysis of these proposals at the time when the sub-

stance of these questions is examined, and will insist upon the rejection of these proposals, which are in disagreement with the principles, purposes and tasks of the United Nations Organization and the adoption of which could only undermine the very basis of the United Nations.

VII

The Propaganda of a New War and the United States of America

THE Soviet Union delegation believes it necessary to raise before the General Assembly a very important question concerning measures against the propaganda of a new war steadily increasing in a number of countries.

More than two years have passed since the Charter of the United Nations was signed at San Francisco and ratified subsequently by 52 nations, which marked the beginning of activity of a new international association that sought as its task to ensure the peace and security of nations and the development and strengthening of international cooperation, in order to promote the economic and social progress of nations.

The creation of the United Nations dates back to the period when the principal enemy of the democratic states—Hitlerite Germany—was defeated and the day of the defeat of Japanese imperialism was near. The attempt of those enemies of mankind to establish their world domination was a complete failure because of the historic victory of the democratic states, headed by the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition. Two primordial hotbeds of war were destroyed. We wish to be sure that they are destroyed forever, that the task of complete disarmament of Germany and Japan set forth by the Allies will be brought to an end, and that those states will never again threaten freedom-loving nations with war and aggression. We wish to be sure that the severe lesson given to the aggressive states during the Second World War has not passed away leaving no traces, and that the fate of the severely punished aggressors of the last war will serve as a stern warning to those who, disregarding their obli-

gations to develop friendly relations among the nations and to strengthen peace and security in the whole world, are preparing both secretly and openly for a new war. A war psychosis which is instigated by the efforts of the militarist and expansionist circles of certain countries—the United States occupying the foremost place among them—is continually spreading and assuming an all the more threatening character.

A furious campaign in the press, mainly in the United States press and in the press of the countries obediently following the example of the United States, like Turkey, has been spread for a considerable time for the purpose of coaxing world public opinion in favor of a new war. All means of psychological influence have been used—newspapers, magazines, radio and films.

This propaganda of a new war is being carried on under various flags and pretexts. But no matter how much the flags and pretexts differ, the essence of the whole propaganda remains the same: to justify the furious armament race which is being carried on by the United States, including atomic weapons; to justify the limitless desires of the influential circles in the United States to fulfill their expansionist plans, the keystone of which is a senseless idea of world domination. Torrents of the propaganda of a new war and appeals to prepare for it better and more expediently flow from the pages of the press of the United States.

A number of newspapers and magazines, mostly American, cry every day and in every way about a new war, systematically promoting this baneful psychological coaxing of the public opinion of their countries. The war-mongers indulge in propaganda under a smokescreen of cries about the strengthening of national defense and the so-called necessity to fight against a war danger which allegedly comes from other countries. The war-mongering propagandists try by hook and crook to frighten people poorly versed in politics by fables and vicious fabrications and slanders about alleged preparations on the part of the Soviet Union to attack the United States. They certainly know only too well that they are telling lies and slanders, that the Soviet Union is not threatening in any way an attack on any country; that the

Soviet Union is devoting all its forces to the cause of rehabilitation of the areas that either were destroyed by the war or which suffered general damage in the course of the war; that the Soviet Union is devoting all its efforts to the cause of rehabilitation and further development of its national economy.

The war-mongers and propagandists active in the United States and in the United Kingdom, Turkey and Greece, and in some other countries as well, are well aware of the fact that the whole population of the Soviet Union—workers, peasants, intellectuals—condemn unanimously any attempts to bring about a new war, and such a thing is impossible in the Soviet Union. (*Applause.*) The Soviet Union is engaged in the work of peaceful reconstruction, is peacefully laboring, having much to do in the field of rehabilitation of areas damaged by the war, and in that of strengthening and further development of its national economy which suffered from the heavy blows of the war imposed upon the Soviet Union by the Hitlerite bandits. There is no place in the Soviet Union, the land of socialist democracy, the land of peaceful construction of a new life, for anything even of remote likeness to what has taken place in some countries which consider themselves to be democratic and progressive, and at the same time, allow such shameful performances as war propaganda and poisoning of public opinion with the venom of hatred and enmity toward other nations. Should any person in the Soviet Union make a statement, even in infinitesimal degree resembling the above-mentioned statements which are full of criminal greediness for a new manslaughter, such a statement would meet with a severe rebuff and public disapproval as a socially dangerous act leading to serious harm.

Nevertheless, the gentlemen who make their profession the baiting of the Soviet Union and other democratic eastern European countries, and the baiting of consistent democrats and antagonists of a new war in other countries as well, never lack false and slanderous insinuations manufactured by these provocateurs and war-mongers and spread all over the world through numerous information channels.

They stubbornly preach that a new war is inevitable and

even necessary, under the pretext that it is necessary to forestall the alleged aggressive policy of the Soviet Union and other eastern European countries. Really, this is to lay the fault at another man's door. Truly, as a Russian proverb says: though it is he who flogs, he cries out in the pretence of pain. (*Applause.*)

The preparation for a new war is being carried on literally before the eyes of the whole world. The war-mongers and propagandists now do not even try to conceal it. They openly threaten the peace-loving nations with war, trying at the same time to shift on to them the responsibility for the creation of a new hotbed of slaughter.

As one can judge by a number of signs, the preparation for a new war has already passed the stage of sheer propaganda, psychological coaxing and war of nerves. Numerous facts prove that in some countries—and this is particularly the case in the United States of America—the war psychosis is being warmed up by putting into effect practical measures of a military and strategic character, together with such organizational and technical measures as the construction of new military bases, relocation of armed forces in accordance with the plans of future military operations, expansion of manufacture of new armaments, and feverish work for the purpose of improving existing weapons.

Simultaneously, military blocs, military agreements on so-called mutual defense are being formed and concluded, measures for the unification of armaments are being elaborated, and the general headquarters plans for a new war are being worked out. The American journalist Leon Pearson, in a recent broadcast, had reason to admit that "American military officers slowly and carefully are preparing for the next world war, in which the enemy will be Russia."

This is the way in which the war-mongers and propagandists of a new war are acting. Being afraid of a new crisis, they are instigating a new war, expecting to remove by such means the approaching menace of collapse and loss of their profits.

The instigators of a new war are stirring up a crazy plan to put under their domination by means of armored fists the countries that struggle for their independence and reject the

right of other powers to interfere with their internal affairs and try to dictate to them the canons of both foreign and home policy.

The war-mongers calling for a new war and inciting their partisans against certain powers expect to achieve their ends through a local war. Apparently they do not take into account the experience of the past wars, which teaches us that nowadays any new war inevitably becomes a new *world* war. They forget the fact that a new world war, with all its insane destruction, ruin of many cities, extermination of millions of people and the vast material values accumulated through human labor, will crush upon mankind as a new immense disaster and holocaust and throw mankind many decades back.

War as a Source of Profit of American Monopolies

THE most active role in the promotion of this propaganda is assumed by the representatives of American capitalist monopolies, by representatives of the largest enterprises and the leading branches of American industry, by representatives of banking and financial groups. These are the groups that have received from the Second World War great profits and accumulated vast capital, as was the case in the First World War.

Comparing the five prewar years, 1935 to 1939 inclusive, with the five years of the Second World War, 1940 to 1944, inclusive, we find that the profits of all American corporations for the five prewar years amounted, after payment of taxes, to 15.3 billion dollars, and for the five years of the Second World War those profits amounted, after payment of taxes, to 42.3 billion dollars. According to the data of the Department of Commerce the net profit of those corporations for six years of the war—1940 to 1945 inclusive—amounted to 52 billion dollars. The basis on which those profits were built was human blood, ruined cities and millions of widows and orphans who bewail their lost bread-winners.

The bulletin *Economic Outlook* published by the Congress of Industrial Organizations, Number 11, 1946, gives interesting data about the increase of profits, after payment of taxes, of 50 companies during the years 1945-1946. It can be seen from these

data that individual monopolies received exorbitant profits from the war, having pocketed 200-300 and more per cent; in some cases these profits amounted to 500 and even 800 per cent. (Atlantic Sugar Refining Company, for instance.)

According to this bulletin these profits exceeded four times the average profits for the period 1936-1939. As far as the commercial profits are concerned, they reached in October, 1946, the highest peak in their history, according to the statement by John Steelman, Director of the Board of Economic Stabilization.

Thus, in certain countries, the war is not so hateful after all to those groups of society which skillfully utilize the hardships of war-time for the purpose of their own enrichment. Therefore, it is not by accident that James Allen in his book *International Monopolies and Peace* states that in capitalist countries economy suffers so-called "loss of balance" and "radical disruption," and quotes from the report of a governmental body engaged in the research of this particular problem some extracts which lead to the conclusion that "only under the conditions of war is the modern economic system able to secure approximately full employment." Any comments on this frank confession are hardly needed. It speaks eloquently for itself.

It should be noted that the capitalist monopolies, having secured a decisive influence during the war, have retained this influence on the termination of the war, skillfully utilizing for this purpose governmental subsidies and grants of billions of dollars, as well as the protection which they enjoyed and are still enjoying from the various governmental agencies and organizations. This is facilitated by the close connection of the monopolies with senators and members of governments, many of whom often are either officials or partners in the monopolistic corporations.

This situation affects also the industrial scientific-technical activity concentrated in the laboratories of various large corporations.

The same can be said with regard to the research field in the use of atomic energy. Such capitalist monopolies as Dupont chemical trust, Monsanto Chemical Company, Westinghouse

company, General Electric, Standard Oil, and others are most closely connected with this research work, being complete masters in the field. Before the war they maintained the closest cartel connections with German trusts, and many cartel agreements contained a clause to the effect that there would be a renewal of the exchange of information after the termination of the war.

All these facts suffice to explain the extreme interest of the various capitalist monopolies in the manufacture of atomic weapons. One can find in these facts an explanation for the stubborn resistance to the justified demands to outlaw the manufacture of atomic weapons and destroy the stock of atomic bombs, in the manufacture of which tremendous sums are invested. The rush for profits on the part of the capitalist monopolies, their endeavor to maintain by all means and to develop further those branches of war industry which yield large profits, cannot but influence foreign policy, strengthening militaristic, expansionist and aggressive tendencies to satisfy the ever-increasing appetite of the influential monopolistic circles.

Who is Inciting the New War?

SUCH is the soil in the United States of America that feeds the propaganda of a new war. The promoters of this propaganda are not only prominent representatives of American influential industrial and military circles, influential organs of the press and prominent politicians, but also official representatives of the American Government as well. It is by no means accidental that the particularly violent war-mongers among them are those who are closely connected already with commercial, industrial and financial trusts, concerns and monopolies. There is no need to name too many names; it is sufficient to name some of them, having in view certainly not their personalities, personal convictions, personal merits, and so on, but mainly those social groups, enterprises, industrial, technical and scientific societies and firms whose views and interests these persons represent.

1. Dorn, Member of the House of Representatives. On May

7 when the House of Representatives discussed the proposed relief assistance for the Greek and Turkish Governments, he made a cynical statement worthy of an experienced war-monger to the effect that "the Soviet Union cannot be halted by four hundred million dollars." "But this can be done," he said, "with the aid of a big air force and the bombing of potential industrial centers of the Soviet Union, the Ural Mountains industrial area, and other vital places." This was said from the floor of the House of Representatives of the United States of America by a man who considers himself to be a representative of the people of the United States of America.

2. Jordan, the President of the National Industrial Conference Board. He made a slanderous statement concerning the Soviet Union. According to Jordan, the above-named Jordan, for whom the sky is the limit, the United States of America should manufacture many atomic bombs and quickly release them whether there is or is not any reason to believe that the country concerned is manufacturing armaments.

3. Earle, a former United States Minister in Bulgaria, who was testifying before the Committee on un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, stated in a provocative manner that the United States of America should immediately use atomic bombs against the country which refuses to agree with the American draft inspection system. Frightening his listeners with stories of Soviet "reactive bombs released from submarines," he insisted that "the most terrible weapons should be secretly perfected," and that "the Russians should be informed that when the first atom bomb is dropped on us" (the United States of America) "we will destroy every village in Russia."

4. Eaton, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, published in the *American Magazine* an article in which he stated that "we are still able to block Russia psychologically; if we fail in this we should rout Russia by the force of weapons . . ."

Where has it been said? It has been said in the *American Magazine*. By whom has it been said? By the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. What kind of a policy can one

expect from such a Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs? (*Laughter, excitement in the audience.*)

5. Senator McMahon, former Chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, stated in Congress that the "United States should be the first to drop atom bombs if the atom war is inevitable."

In another speech of his, McMahon stated that, should the negotiations on international control over atomic energy fail, there are four possibilities left for the United States: first, to accumulate a tremendous stock of atom bombs; second, immediately to begin the war; third, to set up an international control authority without participation of the Soviet Union; fourth, to fix a date for the coming into force of international control and declare that any country refusing to recognize it is guilty of "aggression."

6. Senator Brooks, from Illinois, in his speech in the Senate on March 12, 1947, did not hesitate to declare quite cynically that had the United States listened to the advice the Republican Party offered before the war, and "had the Germans eaten up Russia," the present Truman program would have been unnecessary. He added that in wartime the United States rendered assistance to the Soviet Union, and now, said Brooks, the United States might be compelled to wage war against the Soviet Union.

7. General Deane, the former head of the United States Military Mission in the Soviet Union, writes in his book that the United States military program should be designed to meet specialized situations which war with the Soviet Union would entail.

8. Harwood, Vice-President of the industrial firm of Cutler-Hammer, Incorporated, according to the *Milwaukee Journal*, said that the atom bomb is a poor weapon because instead of exterminating human beings only it destroys excessive amounts of property as well. This Mr. Harwood cynically said at the conference of the American Inter-Professional Institute of Milwaukee: "Though it sounds cruel, still the type of weapon we should possess if we are to wage war is such a one that will kill only human beings. Such a weapon will eliminate during the next

are in the hands of such newspapers magnates as Morgan, Rockefeller, Ford, Hearst, McCormick and others do not lag behind the reactionary political statesmen who busy themselves with war-mongering. As is known, Morgan controls the following magazines: *Time*, *Life*, and *Fortune*, published by the well-known publishing corporation, Time Incorporated, the largest shareholder being, by the way, Brown Brothers, Harriman and Company.

It is well-known that the richest American capitalists own or control large organs of the press—magazines, newspapers, bulletins; they have their own publishing houses inundating the book market with specific publications. By the order of their bosses all these publications are waging sharp propaganda for unleashing a new war, using all possible insinuations and forgeries fabricated in a certain way with the view to provoking hatred toward the Soviet Union and other Eastern European nations of a new democracy. Provocative appeals for an attack on other nations which allegedly threaten the security of the United States are being daily trumpeted from the pages of these newspapers and magazines, although these organs of the press, as well as their bosses, are well aware of the fact that nobody is going to attack the United States and that there exists no danger whatsoever for the United States in this respect.

It cannot be but mentioned as an example that such organs of the press as *The New York Herald Tribune* and a number of other similar organs, especially of the Hearst press, publish systematically all possible provocative articles which promote in the minds of their readers the necessity for "military action if Europe faces collapse or falls under the control of the Soviet Union." There is no small number of statements of this kind. But the main thing to be pointed out is not the fact that such statements take place, but the fact that they do not encounter the necessary rebuff, thus only encouraging further provocations on their part.

All this press is entirely in the hands of the bosses of various newspaper enterprises and does what is ordered, claiming their literary exercises to be the expression of public opinion and pre-

sending the picture in such a way as if they were the mouthpiece of the feelings, aspirations and cravings of the American people. It may be said with confidence, however, that the American people, as well as the peoples of the other democratic countries, are against a new war while the scars made by the last war have not yet healed on their bodies. But in most cases it is impossible for the people to speak of their needs and wishes in books, magazines and newspapers published in millions of copies. This, of course, facilitates the work of the propagandists and instigators of a new war who take advantage of their privileged position against the interests of peace-loving peoples.

I cannot but add a few words with regard to the propaganda of a new war on the part of various scientific institutions and universities in the United States. In this connection, one cannot but mention the works recently published by Yale University under the title *The Absolute Weapon*, in which a group of scientists, speaking of the atomic weapon and the control of the use of atomic energy, found nothing better than to come to the conclusion that "the most effective existing means of preventing war is the ability to launch atomic war literally in no time."

Under the mask of scientific objectivity, this book treats different variants of atomic war, and says that if the United States air forces "succeed in using bases in northern Canada, the towns of the Soviet Union will be within a much shorter distance," and thus "it will be possible to destroy, operating from their own bases, the majority of the large cities of any other power."

What is that other power?

It is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

These are the hopes of the honorable Yale scientists, as expressed in a book published in the United States under the title *The Absolute Weapon*.

In this book, dedicated to the so-called "absolute weapon" (the atomic bomb), a group of American authors are busy with suspicious speculations that "unless we" (that is, the Americans—A. V.) "can strike first and eliminate a threat before it is

realized in action—something which our national constitution obviously forbids—we are bound to perish under atomic attack . . .”

These gentlemen are ready, in other words, to sacrifice the Constitution of the United States in order to attack and drop atomic bombs first, even while nobody in the world is prepared to drop atomic bombs on the United States. That there is no such plan is very well known to the authors of this false and slanderous book, but it is profitable for them to speak of it. The hired writers of lies are spreading the lie all over the world in millions of copies because such is the order given by the monopolies who hold within their grasp all the media of information.

Under the mask of various “scientific” considerations, this book speaks about the danger “of one-sided actions on the part of this or that great power,” and says that if “one-sided actions” are taken in the future, they are to be expected mostly on the part of the Soviet Union. From this speculation comes the provocative conclusion that “serious danger toward the United States lies in the fact that without due warning from our side” (that is, on the part of the United States) “the Soviet Union might, one fine day, begin war against us.”

The extracts I have mentioned alone from this book are sufficient to make it clear how varied, in the United States, are the forms and methods of propaganda for a new war directed first of all against the Soviet Union.

How far has gone the propaganda for a new war, accompanied by demands for the production of the deadliest types of weapons, might be seen from the report published in the magazine *Chemical and Engineering News*, of Mr. Merck, where in the section under the title “Science and Civilization,” all the deadly advantages of bacterial warfare are openly advocated. Just the same direction is also taken in an article in the *Army Ordnance*, concerning a new toxin, the development of which, according to this magazine, cost 50 million dollars, which expenses, however, to use the author’s words, “are fully justified,” because one ounce of this toxin is quite sufficient to kill 180 million people.

When reading all this so-called quasi-scientific literature, one feels what a satanic energy is being developed by the war-mongers

and propagandists of a new war in order to create a suitable atmosphere capable of poisoning the people's minds with war madness.

What kind of mood is being created in public circles by such propaganda, spread all over the world by the reactionaries and felt especially in the circles of United States influence, might be seen from an article by Vernon Bartlett, a British journalist, who published it in early August of this year in the London newspaper *News Chronicle*. In this article, one may read the following noteworthy lines: "From the moment a person, going to the zone controlled by General MacArthur, reaches Okinawa on his way to Japan, he is thunderstruck by the tone of the American newspapers speaking of the Soviet Union. Certainly an American soldier is not to blame if, after the reading of these newspapers, he comes to a conclusion that war against Russia is probably a matter of months."

Mr. Bartlett continues: "The Japanese would be fools if they did not notice this almost hysterical attitude."

This information coincides with the material in the journal *Newsweek*, which published an article of the editor of the foreign section of this magazine, Mr. Kern, who recently returned from Japan. Mr. Kern says that in Japan the American generals are systematically agitating the Japanese militarists in the direction of the inevitability and necessity of war against the Soviet Union. Mr. Kern writes that a considerable number of Japanese *kamikaze* fliers, who came to the American airdromes, stated their readiness to participate in the new war against the Soviet Union which they heard and which they believed to have already started. Mr. Kern mentions the fact that the Japanese would probably welcome the possibility of fighting the Russians, and that the Japanese Army, supported by the United States, could perhaps "conquer Russian Asia" east of Baikal. Mr. Kern added that "the United States domination on the seas would make it possible to land at almost any point and Japan herself would be out of danger under protection of superior American air and naval forces. These threatening strategical facts explain why Russia's absence at the Peace Conference on Japan would never be felt."

These facts explain many other things, and they explain why every decent human being must blush for shame. (*Applause*).

THUS for a long time in the United States of America war propaganda has been systematically carried on, with the following main trends:

1. Fear of the Soviet Union, as a mighty power allegedly seeking world domination and preparing an attack on the United States of America, is propagated and inspired in every way. While doing so, slanderous fictions and provocative attacks of all possible kinds are used against the Soviet Union most shamelessly.

2. Open propaganda is being carried on for the increase of armaments and further perfection of atomic weapons, while any attempt to limit or to prohibit the use of atomic weapons is rejected.

3. Statements openly calling for an immediate attack against the Soviet Union are made, using provocative intimidations with the military strength of the Soviet Union on the one hand, and stressing the necessity of taking advantage of the present situation when, in the war-mongers' opinion, the Soviet Union is weak militarily, not having fully recovered after the Second World War.

Thus we have a shameless propaganda of fear against the power of the so-called Polar Bear, the Soviet Union; and on the other hand it is stated that the Polar Bear should be taken fast while he is not yet strong enough and while his wounds are not yet healed.

4. The war-hungry psychosis is stimulated in every way among the American public, excited and fanned by militarist and expansionist circles of the United States of America.

American progressive persons are aware of this situation and are making efforts to expose the preparation for war, which is now carried on in America, and to sober the minds of those affected with a war madness. These progressive persons in the United States of America and the progressive elements of the American press expose the military preparation which is carried on in the United States, instigated by military groups and various reactionary organizations.

For example, Kingdon, the President of the organization of the Progressive Citizens of America, stated on this matter in the *New York Times* that in the center of all this propaganda are militaristically minded persons who occupy high posts in the War and Navy Departments, Representatives and Senators, leaders of monopolies and certain representatives of religious circles who lend an ear to war cries. It is said further that the war party hopes that it would be possible to fabricate some incident and to use it as an excuse for atomic bombing.

The American magazine *The American Mercury*, in its issue of last February, analyzed the project of the American Army which is preparing itself for the third world war. It is stated in the article that, "Industrial preparedness is the keystone of Government planning in Washington today with a view to the possibility of a third world war." Since this conclusion has been made by such military authorities as Patterson, Royall and other leaders of the American Army, this article, therefore, becomes of special significance.

FROM the above, it follows quite obviously that American reactionary circles who reckon only with their own selfish interests and are ready for the sake of these interests to plunge humanity into a new exterminating world war, are the main inciters in the field of propaganda and instigation of a new war.

The American reactionaries, however, are not alone in these efforts of theirs. They are supported by their adherents in some other countries who are busy knocking together military-political and simply political Western, Northern and other blocs. In this connection it is deemed necessary to mention the statements made by certain British politicians who, it is true, are acting not so resolutely as their United States adherents, but mostly in an underhanded way—yet in the same alarmist spirit.

Everybody remembers Churchill's speech at Fulton, Missouri, where speaking of "general strategic conceptions," as Churchill called his main utterances, the former British Premier performed "a dangerous act calculated to sow the seeds of discord among the Allied governments and to hamper their cooperation," as

was justly stated by Generalissimo Stalin in this connection, stressing that, "There is no doubt that the setup of Mr. Churchill is a setup for war, a call to war with the Soviet Union."

We all remember Churchill opposing the United Nations as an association of nations speaking various languages, with an association of English-speaking nations, thus associating himself with Hitler, who started launching the war by "announcing his racial theory, declaring that only those people speaking the German language represent a fully valuable nation." (Stalin).

Churchill now says that only people who speak the English language are nations in the full sense of that term.

We remember many other things in that speech in which Churchill resorted to insinuations and slander against the Soviet Union.

Churchill the father is echoed by his son who beat the record of war instigation in his statement made at Sydney on September 3.

The family utterances of the Churchills by themselves would be of little interest to anybody, but they are an indicator of that black work which is being carried on in certain British circles against the cause of peace and which is directed to organizing a new war, no matter whether it is in the form of repeating Churchill's military crusade against Russia or in any other form; the form is not important.

In this connection one also ought to point out the fact that the Anglo-American Combined Chiefs of Staff in Washington are continuing to function. It is known that Great Britain is represented on the Combined Chiefs of Staff by the military mission headed by General Morgan, and that the United States is represented by a military mission headed by Admiral Leahy. This Anglo-American Combined Chiefs of Staff was set up to coordinate military operations against Germany and Japan and still continues to exist, and it is not known for what purpose, in spite of the fact that the war ceased two years ago.

There is no need to recapitulate numerous facts of quite an unbridled, slanderous and provocative campaign, a campaign which

goes beyond the limits of the admissible and of war-mongering against the Soviet Union, and which has been carried on for a long period of time in Turkey. The reactionary press of Turkey is trying to keep in step with the reactionary press of the United States. A Russian proverb tells of a lobster following a horse and trying to make claw prints to match the horse's hoof prints. The Turkish press day after day disseminates dirty slanders about the Soviet Union, which allegedly intends to seize Turkey (newspaper *Aksham*), and is making provocative prophecies that "the United Nations will try to inflict the decisive blow upon Russia from the shores of the Black Sea" (newspaper *Democracy Iksan*). The Turkish press is instigating the Turkish people to prepare for war and is simultaneously praising the military power of the United States of America, stating that it must necessarily enter into war against the Soviet Union.

The notorious *Jumhuriyet*, in an article by one Daver, states with cynical frankness that, "The only way out which may put Moscow on the right road is war." In *Uluse*, he is echoed by the Deputy Atai, Editor-in-Chief of this paper, who states that, "The time has already come for America and England to take more decisive measures."

Yalchin, the Editor of *Tanin*, who is famous for his provocative activities, is not far behind them. Last September he wrote that the time had come to invite the Russians for frank talks, having hung the atomic bomb over the conference table. He demanded that an ultimatum be sent to the Russians, stating that, "They would be subjected to a shower of atomic bombs if they did not agree to the establishment of a new international order." The same Yalchin wrote recently that it was only possible to speak the language of ultimatum with Moscow, and asked for the "uniting of the whole world against Russia." The language of ultimatum of which Yalchin dreams is the language familiar to all of us: the language of the United States "tough policy."

The same provocative appeals are voiced by other mercenary scribblers, such as Adviz from the reactionary Turkish paper *Ergeneckon*, Professor Likhat Erim, Deputy and member of the Foreign Commission of the Mejlis, and some others.

This provocative hubbub is vigorously supported by the Greek reactionary papers, in particular by the *Ellinicon Ema*, which recently published an article stating: "Let the Russians not forget that the main source of Russian petroleum in Baku is as on a saucer within only a hundred kilometers of the Turkish border."

All this goes unpunished before the eyes of the whole world.

Such are the plottings of enemies of peace instigating a new war for the sake of their own selfish interests and war profits, bringing new perils and calamities to mankind. There is no doubt that this campaign of instigating a new war meets with rigorous and resolute condemnation on the part of millions of people.

The Proposals of the Soviet Union

THE Government of the Soviet Union feels that the conscience of the nations who carried the whole burden of the recently terminated Second World War, who paid for that war imposed on them with their own blood, suffering and ruins, cannot reconcile itself with such a state of affairs.

The delegation of the Soviet Union, on instruction of the Government of the Soviet Union, declares that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers as a matter of urgency the adoption by the United Nations of measures directed against the propaganda of a new war; propaganda which is being carried out at present in some countries, and particularly in the United States of America. To this end the Soviet Union delegation suggests that the following resolution be adopted:

1. The United Nations Organization condemns the criminal propaganda of a new war which is being carried on by reactionary circles in a number of countries, particularly in the United States, Turkey and Greece by means of spreading all kinds of insinuations through radio, press, cinema and public statements and which contains an open appeal for an attack on peace-loving democratic countries.

2. The United Nations Organization considers the tolerance, and more so the support, of such propaganda of a new war, that would inevitably be transformed into a third world war, as a violation of the obligations undertaken

by the members of the United Nations Organization, whose Charter provides for an obligation "to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace" so "that international peace and security and justice are not endangered." (Article I, Paragraph 2; Article II, Paragraph 3.)

3. The United Nations Organization considers it necessary to urge the governments of all countries on pain of criminal punishment to prohibit war propaganda in any form whatever and to take measures for the prevention and suppression of war propaganda as a socially dangerous activity threatening the vital interests and welfare of the peace-loving nations of the world.

4. The United Nations Organization reaffirms the necessity for the speediest implementation of the decision of the General Assembly of December 14, 1946, with regard to the reduction of armaments and the decision of the General Assembly of January 24, 1946, on the exclusion from national armaments of atomic weapons and all other principal types of weapons designed for mass extermination, and considers that the implementation of these decisions meets the interests of all the peace-loving nations and would be the heaviest blow upon the propaganda and the instigators of a new war.

Generalissimo Stalin, in his welcome to Moscow, on the occasion of celebrating the eight hundredth anniversary of the foundation of Moscow, indicated that Moscow was the herald of the fight for peace and friendship among nations and the herald of the struggle against the inciters of a new war. These words of the great leader of the Soviet people found a profound reaction in the hearts of all the peoples of the Soviet Union and, we believe, in the hearts of all common, honest, progressive people throughout the world.

The Soviet people will not spare any efforts in order to settle successfully this great problem. (*Prolonged applause.*)



Mr. Chairman, Fellow Delegates:

A year has passed since the First Session of the General Assembly. It is necessary to cast a retrospective glance on the road traversed, and to make an analysis of the work performed during this time by the Organization of the United Nations, to summarize certain results, and to outline possible perspectives.

Each delegation, each member state of the Organization of the United Nations has the duty to perform its obligations in an unprejudiced manner and with consciousness of its high responsibility in this matter, which requires complete clarity, objectivity, and respect for truth, which must be placed above all else.

Casting its retrospective glance, the Soviet Union delegation must note that during the period covered by the Report there were serious setbacks in the activity of the United Nations. These setbacks should be disclosed and identified with all determination and consistency. They have been expressed mainly in a departure from the most important principle on which this Organization is founded, and also, in some cases, in a direct violation of a number of important decisions of the General Assembly. These setbacks have been, to a large extent, the result of a tendency on the part of such influential members of the United Nations as the United States of America, and also the United Kingdom, to utilize the Organization in the interests of their small group, without any regard for international cooperation on the basis of the principles set forth in the Charter.

The policy of individual states in using this Organization for the purpose of achieving their own selfish and narrowly conceived interests leads to the undermining of the Organization's prestige, just as took place in the case of the League of Nations of grievous memory.

On the other hand, the unsatisfactory state of affairs in the United Nations Organization, which has a telling negative effect upon its prestige, is a result of ignoring the Organization of the United Nations by the states mentioned above, which are attempting to carry out a number of practical measures outside the framework of the United Nations and with a lack of due regard for it.

It is necessary to draw serious attention to the menace thus created to the United Nations Organization by such a policy, which is incompatible with the principles of the Charter and with the aims and purposes contemplated by the United Nations when they established the Organization.

I

The U.S.A. and Great Britain Are Opposed to the Reduction of Armaments

Among the most important setbacks in the activities of the United Nations Organization, one should mention, in the first place, the unsatisfactory fulfillment of the Assembly's decision of December 14, 1946, with regard to the universal reduction of armaments. The resolution on the universal reduction of armaments, which was passed unanimously by the General Assembly, corresponds to the vital interest of millions of people who, in spite of the termination of the Second World War, still shoulder the burdens of military expenses and those connected with the unceasing increase of armaments.

The decision on the universal reduction of armaments, which was adopted by the Assembly, is at the same time an expression of the aspirations and demands of the peace-loving nations for the establishment of a durable peace and of international

security as well as an expression of demands dictated by the sufferings which those nations experienced during the war and the sacrifices they made. For this particular reason, the above-mentioned decision met the profound approval of the peoples of the whole world, and they hoped for its rapid and complete fulfillment and realization. However, these hopes were not realized.

The representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom, at the time attempts were being made to outline within the framework of the Security Council and the Commission of Conventional Armaments practical measures for the realization of the General Assembly's decision on the universal regulation and reduction of armaments, proposed such terms for the reduction of armaments as could only result in failure to realize the abovementioned decision of the Assembly. The whole activity of the United States and United Kingdom delegations in the Commission for Conventional Armaments testifies to the fact that the United States and the United Kingdom are unwilling to disarm and that they are putting a brake on the realization of disarmament, which gives reason for anxiety among the peace-loving nations of the world.

The statement of Mr. Bevin, made in Southport, to the effect that he was not going to further disarmament, serves as a convincing answer to the question about the reasons for the unsatisfactory state of affairs with regard to the realization of the Assembly's decision on the reduction of armaments. The recent statement by the President of the United States, Mr. Truman, in Petropolis, in which the President emphasized that the United States military forces are to be maintained, while saying not a single word about the obligation to make a reduction of armed forces assumed by the United Nations in accordance with the General Assembly's decisions, speaks of the same.

Such a position taken by the United States of America and Great Britain with regard to the reduction of armaments and the absence of positive results in the solving of problems indicated in the resolution of December 14, 1946, gives rise, as we have mentioned, to justified apprehension and alarm with regard to the possibility of successfully completing the undertaken task; the speed-up of armaments, atomic weapons included, and military preparations of some military and economically powerful states particularly promote the spreading of the feeling of alarm and anxiety. This undermines the faith in the sincerity of peaceful declarations and statements on the determination to make future generations free from the hardships and horrors of war.

II

The United States of America Disrupts the Outlawing of Atomic Weapons

The unsatisfactory state of affairs with regard to the outlawing of atomic and other principal types of weapons of mass extermination gives rise to particular anxiety on the part of millions of common people. The anxiety is all the more justified for the reason that atomic weapons are weapons of attack and aggression. After one and a half years of work by the Atomic Energy Commission, none of the tasks set before it by the General Assembly's resolution of January 24, 1946, has been completed, nor has there been the slightest progress in the fulfillment of those tasks.

The Soviet Government, for its part, undertook a number of steps with a view to contributing to the positive solution of this question. In addition to and in furtherance of its own proposal concerning the conclusion of an international convention for outlawing atomic and other principal types of weapons of mass extermination, the Soviet Government submitted for the consideration of the Atomic Energy Commission a proposal dealing with the principal provisions for international control over atomic energy. Nevertheless that proposal met with resistance, mainly on the part of the

United States of America. The United States of America, believing that it will continue to exercise a monopoly with regard to atomic weapons, resists any attempts to dismantle the existing stock of atomic bombs and outlaw their further production. At the same time the United States of America systematically increases the production of such bombs. The disagreement among the Commission members in this respect hinders the work of the Commission and paralyzes all efforts directed to the successful solution of the task set before the Commission.

At the same time there is no doubt whatever that many of these disagreements could have been eliminated, provided there had been displayed a more objective approach to the question on the part of some delegations, the American delegation included. For instance, it could have been possible to eliminate the disagreement that arose in connection with the Soviet delegation's proposal on destruction of atomic bomb stocks upon the coming into force of the convention outlawing atomic weapons. As is known, the majority in the Commission agreed in principle that it is necessary to destroy the stock of atomic weapons and use their nuclear energy only for peaceful aims. Only one delegation, to wit, the delegation of the United States of America, continues to object to the destruction of the stock of atomic bombs, thus obstructing a decision on the question approved by the majority of the Commission.

One's attention is attracted by the situation that has been created with regard to the question of inspection. The American delegation previously was stressing the particular significance of inspection. In the Soviet delegation's proposals inspection also is the main issue after the outlawing of atomic weapons.

At present, the American delegation has unexpectedly begun to lessen the importance of inspection, putting into first place other questions, such as the transfer of atomic enterprises to the ownership of an international body, management, issuance of licenses and so forth. At the same time, the American delegation does not want the opinions of authoritative men of science to be taken into account. For instance, in the memorandum of the British Council of Atomic Scientists Association, which includes such prominent scientists as Rudolf Peierls, Oliphant, Moon and others, that memorandum objects to the ownership of the means of production of atomic energy by an international control body. As is known, the British scientists emphasize in this memorandum that transfer to this international control body of the means of production "into its full ownership, in the usual sense of this word, would give rise to difficulties, since this ownership would give the control body the right to decide whether this or that country is entitled to construct atomic energy plants and the right to prevent the use of energy manufactured by such plants and to set the terms for supplying such energy."

The British scientists, criticizing the thesis defended by the American delegation since the time of Mr. Baruch's activity, justly state; "Such a restriction would make it possible to intervene in the economic life of each country to an extent not necessary for preventing the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes." This is the voice of men of science who consider this problem from the point of view of the interests of scientific progress, which is incompatible with unrestricted control exercised by some centralized international body over scientific and research work directed at the achievement of peaceful aims of discoveries and increase of energy resources.

This is why the memorandum of the British scientists — which I have cited — actually speaks in favor of the plan that would provide a guarantee against accumulation of dangerous materials without the sanction of the organs for atomic energy control and would give all the nations, at the same time, the possibility of initiating construction on their territory of plants producing atomic energy in addition to other energy resources on those territories.

The USSR is for the Outlawing of Atomic Weapons, for Strict International Control

The Soviet Union proposed in the interests of universal peace to conclude a convention outlawing the use of atomic weapons in all circumstances whatever. This proposal made by the Soviet Union found a warm response and support in all countries. "Such a convention," says the memorandum of the British Association of Scientific Workers, "appears to us to be highly desirable, and it is difficult to justify the reluctance on the part of the United Kingdom and the United States of America to agree to it." The British scientists, evaluating the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics' demand to destroy the stock of atomic weapons and cease the production of new ones, write that such a provision appears to be eminently reasonable.

The Soviet Union stands for strict international control over atomic energy plants but such control, however, which should not be transformed into interference with those branches of national industry and with those questions that are not connected with atomic energy. Here again, the British atomic scientists are right, because in the memorandum covered on January 23 of this year they state "that the right of inspection should be limited as far as possible and should not serve to satisfy excessive curiosity with regard to legitimate industry and other forms of activity."

The British scientists in this memorandum published in August, 1947, once more point to the necessity of restricting to certain limits the rights of inspection, which should not serve the aims of organized economic and military espionage. The memorandum states: "The United States and other supporters of the Baruch plan should be encouraged to formulate safeguards to ensure that any inspection scheme should not develop into an elaborate system of espionage."

Proceeding from the principles outlined above of the establishment of international control which should be, we repeat, real, strong and effective, the Soviet delegation believes it necessary to put the inspection authorities within certain limits, to restrict their rights to the aims of genuine control over atomic energy, excluding the possibility of the use of the control authorities for arbitrary intervention in any branches of the national economy of any country, not considering the fact that such intervention can only undermine and destroy the national economy of any country. The United States delegation and some other delegations who support it insist particularly that the international control authority, transformed into an owner and acting accordingly in the interests of the majority of this authority, on whose benevolent attitude the Soviet Union cannot count (Laughter) should own and manage all plants manufacturing atomic materials in a dangerous quantity. And the delegations that group around the United States delegation and act under its leadership try to achieve exactly such a situation. The previously quoted memorandum of the British scientists does not conceal the fact that the United States plan for the organization of control over atomic energy provides for measures which, as stated in the memorandum, "can be interpreted as a support of the United States dominance in the province of atomic energy."

The Soviet delegation is opposed to such a thesis and will remain opposed to it in future, trying to achieve not the dominance of a single nation in the international control body but equality of all participants in this body in all its activities.

It should be recalled in this connection that the United States representatives on the Atomic Energy Commission stubbornly oppose the simultaneous establishment of control over atomic industry in all its stages, from the extraction of raw material up to the output of finished products.

The United States representatives propose to postpone indefinitely the establishment of control over the most dangerous final stages of atomic manufacturing, stages in

which the United States considers itself at the present time to be holding a monopoly. At the same time, the United States insists that control over the initial stage — extraction of the raw material — should be immediately introduced. It is abundantly clear that the American position cannot be otherwise interpreted but as a position according to which control is not to be extended to the United States of America while all other countries should immediately come under international control. (Applause.)

Such is the state of affairs with regard to the atomic question.

Naturally, one cannot expect successful results from work in which there is shown on the part of some delegations no intention to cooperate for the purpose of achieving the aims stated in the General Assembly's resolution of December 14, 1946. Such a situation cannot be tolerated. One cannot reconcile oneself to the fact that the threat of the use of atomic energy for the purposes of mass destruction and extermination of peaceful populations is not yet eliminated. The conscience of the nations cannot tolerate such a state of affairs when, notwithstanding the appeal of the United Nations Organization to eliminate atomic weapons and other principal types of means of mass extermination of human beings, the manufacturing of such means not only continues but even increases more and more.

IV

The Plans of Truman and Marshall are not Compatible with the Principles of the United Nations Organization

The so-called "Truman Doctrine" and "Marshall Plan" are particularly striking instances of the violation of the principles of the United Nations Organization, and of the ignoring of the Organization. (Applause.)

The experience of the past few months has proved that the proclamation of this doctrine meant that the United States Government openly gave up the principles of international cooperation and concerted action of the great powers, and passed to attempts to dictate its will to other independent nations, utilizing at the same time the economic means allotted as relief for individual countries in need for open political pressure. This has been sufficiently illustrated by the measures undertaken by the United States Government in Greece and Turkey outside the framework of the United Nations Organization, and in evasion of it, as well as by the measures planned for Europe in accordance with the so-called "Marshall Plan." This policy is in deep contradiction to the principle proclaimed by the General Assembly in its resolution of December 11, 1946, that assistance to other countries "should never be used as a political weapon."

The "Marshall Plan" is in fact, as it is perfectly clear now, only another version of the "Truman Doctrine" adjusted to the conditions of postwar Europe. The United States Government, when putting forward this "Plan," apparently expected, with the cooperation of the British and French Governments, to make the European countries that are in need of relief face the necessity of giving up their inalienable rights to dispose of their own economic resources, to plan their own national economy as they see fit, just as the United States Government expected to make all those countries directly dependent on the interests of American monopolies which are seeking to avoid the impending crisis by accelerated export to Europe of accumulated commodities and capital.

As is known, not all the European countries, despite their needs and the difficulties of the postwar economic rehabilitation period, agree to such an infringement of their sovereignty and to such interference in their internal affairs; while on the other hand,

the countries which did consent to take part in the negotiations on this subject at the Paris Conference understand more and more the dangers of their position and the true meaning of this offer of assistance or relief. It is becoming more clear to everybody that the implementation of the "Marshall Plan" would mean the subjugation of European countries to economic and political control exercised by the United States of America, and direct interference on its part in the internal affairs of those countries.

At the same time this "Plan" is an attempt to break Europe into two camps and to complete, with the assistance of the United Kingdom and France, the formation of a bloc of a number of European countries, hostile to the interests of the democratic states of Eastern Europe, and first of all, to the interests of the Soviet Union. The tendency to set up a bloc of a number of Western European countries. Western Germany included, as against the countries of Eastern Europe is an important feature of this "Plan." At the same time, it is intended to use Western Germany and German heavy industry (the Ruhr) as one of the principal economic bases for United States expansion in Europe, in spite of the national interests of the countries which have been victims of German aggression.

It suffices to recall these facts to show indisputably the full incompatibility of such a policy of the United States as well as the policies of the French and United Kingdom Governments which support the United States, with the basic principles of the United Nations Organization.

V

The Violations of the United Nations Organization's Decisions

Neither can one consider as normal such a situation with regard to the relations among the members of the United Nations Organization where foreign armed forces continue to remain on the territories of the members of the Organization, such armed forces being instruments of political interference in their internal affairs and thus creating unequal and subordinate relations among the states, contradictory to the Charter. British troops still remain in Egypt against the will of that country. Troops still remain in Greece in violation of her State Constitution, and in Transjordan which applied for membership in the United Nations. United States troops continue to remain in China. This by no means contributes to the establishment of internal peace in that country. The presence of foreign troops on the territory of non-enemy states should not take place unless such presence is connected with the protection of communications with ex-enemy territories during their occupation. The strengthening of universal peace and mutual confidence among the nations demands an urgent and positive solution of the question of the evacuation from the territories of the non-enemy states of foreign troops when they are not engaged in guarding the communications of their countries with former enemy states.

One should point out also the failure on the part of some members of the Organization to put into effect important decisions of the Assembly: on the Spanish question (Argentina), on the question of discrimination against Indians in South Africa, and the establishment of a trusteeship over the former mandated territory of Southwest Africa (Union of South Africa).

The General Assembly cannot pass by such actions of some individual members of the Organization who disrupt the achievement of the aims set out by the decisions of the Assembly, and who weaken the prestige of the United Nations Organization.

In this connection, we cannot but dwell on the developments which have taken place in Indonesia. These events cannot be qualified otherwise than as an act of aggression

perpetrated against the people of Indonesia by a member state of the United Nations. The unprovoked military attack by the Netherlands against the Indonesian Republic has caused the justified indignation of all honest people throughout the world. (Applause.) Well, did the United Nations render due assistance and defense to the Indonesian people? We all know that this was not the case. As the result of the consideration of the Indonesian question by the Security Council, certain states made no small effort to minimize the importance and significance of developments in Indonesia, and made no small effort to foist upon the Security Council a decision which can by no means be regarded as sufficient to protect the legitimate interests of the Indonesian Republic, which has become a victim of military attack. It is clear that such decisions cannot but undermine the prestige of the United Nations, which is specifically called upon to secure the maintenance of peace among the nations.

At the same time, one's attention is attracted by the fact that while not showing due interest in the elimination of the unsatisfactory state of affairs with regard to the solution of the Spanish and other questions which I have just cited, some influential powers display a particular interest in the Iranian question, which still remains on the agenda of the Security Council, notwithstanding the fact that 18 months have already passed since its complete settlement, and in spite of the request of Iran itself to take this question off the agenda of the Security Council.

It is really worth noting how the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom doggedly try to keep the Iranian question on the agenda of the Security Council at any cost and against any reasoning, for some apparently specific purposes. The extraordinary doggedness displayed in this respect by the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom on the Security Council is all the more worthy of one's attention, because this doggedness has remained unshaken even after a well-grounded clarification was made by the Secretary General to the effect that there are no reasons for the Security Council to deal with the so-called Iranian question.

Touching upon the subject of the Trusteeship Council, the Soviet Union delegation also considers it necessary to note the following:

At the meeting of the General Assembly of December 13, 1946, the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics criticized the agreements on trusteeship over the ex-mandated territories submitted for the approval of the Assembly, for the reason that the very preparation of those agreements and some of their articles did not correspond to what was required by the appropriate Articles of the Charter of the United Nations. The establishment of the Trusteeship Council was based on the said agreements with the above-mentioned setbacks, and this, naturally, could not but influence the Soviet Union delegation's attitude toward the election of the members of the Council. The Soviet Union delegation still continues to maintain the views stated in this respect by the Soviet Union delegation at the meeting of the General Assembly on December 13, 1946.

The Soviet Union delegation, representing a state which is a permanent member of the Trusteeship Council, wishes to express the hope that the above-mentioned violations of the Charter that took place at the time the agreements on trusteeship were concluded will be corrected, which would undoubtedly facilitate the execution by the Trusteeship Council of its tasks.

It goes without saying that this would serve the interests of both the United Nations Organization as a whole and the interests of the population of the trustee territories.

The unsatisfactory state of affairs with regard to the work of the United Nations Organization is not an accident, but it is a direct result of an attitude toward the

Organization on the part of a number of member nations of the Organization, particularly the United States and the United Kingdom. Such an attitude does not facilitate or further the strengthening of the Organization and does not serve the cause of international cooperation. On the contrary, such an attitude leads to the weakening and instability of the United Nations Organization, which undoubtedly is in keeping with the plans and intentions of reactionary elements in the above-mentioned countries, under whose interests a suitable policy is now being carried out.

VI

The USSR is for the Strengthening of the United Nations Organization

As regards the Soviet Union, its policy with regard to the United Nations Organization is a policy of strengthening the Organization ; it is a policy of broadening and strengthening international cooperation; a policy of steady, consistent observance of the Charter and of the implementation and fulfillment of its principles.

The strengthening of the United Nations Organization is only possible on the basis of a respectful attitude toward the political and economic independence of nations, on the basis of a respectful attitude toward the sovereign equality of nations, as well as of a consistent and unconditional observance of one of the most important principles of the United Nations Organization, that is, the principle of unanimity and accord among the great powers in making decisions on the most important problems dealing with the maintenance of international peace and security. This is in full accord with the special responsibility of these powers for the maintenance of universal peace, and is a guarantee of the protection of the interests of all the members of the United Nations Organization, great and small.

The Soviet Union feels that it is its duty to struggle resolutely against any attempts to shake this principle, no matter under what motives or guises these attempts might be made.

It is only left for me to say a few words with regard to the address of the Honorable Secretary of State of the United States of America, Mr. Marshall. In that statement, questions were dealt with which have repeatedly been dealt with before. Most of these questions are included on the agenda of the General Assembly as separate paragraphs, which means that we shall have an opportunity to state our opinion on them at the proper place and at the proper time when they are taken up.

Mr. Marshall's address, however, also raised some other questions.

The Soviet Union delegation considers it essential here and now to dwell upon a few of those questions which were touched upon by Mr. Marshall ; the question, for instance, of the threat to the independence and territorial integrity of Greece. Leaving the discussion of this question at proper length until the time when the General Assembly deals with it according to the adopted agenda, the Soviet Union delegation feels it necessary to state only that the very raising of this question is devoid of any foundation whatever. The charges leveled by the United States delegation against Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania are utterly arbitrary and without any proof. These charges go much further than the conclusions of the majority of the Commission, which were not supported by almost one half of the members of that Commission and which do not stand criticism if one is to take any serious approach to the data on which the conclusions are based. It will not be difficult to prove that the so-called Report of the Balkan Investigating Commission is full of contradictions and gross exaggerations which deprive its conclusions of any importance or significance whatsoever.

Now, as to the question of Korea. Having arbitrarily outlined the situation in such a way that the futility of the work of the Soviet-American Commission on Korea is attributed to the Soviet Union, Mr. Marshall makes a proposal which is in direct violation of the Moscow Agreement on Korea reached by the Foreign Ministers in December, 1945. According to this Agreement, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics undertook the responsibility of preparing a joint solution to the problem of the unification of Korea into one independent democratic state. The new proposal made by Mr. Marshall is a violation of the obligations assumed by the United States of America, and for that reason is not right or acceptable. The United States Government, instead of undertaking arrangements for carrying out adopted measures according to the Moscow Agreement on Korea in December, 1945, and submitting them to the consideration of the Governments of the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and China, prefers to violate its undertakings by attempting to conceal, under the prestige of the General Assembly, its own unilateral and completely unjustifiable actions. The Soviet Government cannot accept such a violation of the agreement on Korea and will insist that the proposal made by Mr. Marshall be rejected for the reason that it is contrary to the obligations assumed under the tripartite agreement by the three powers on Korea.

Now, as to the question of the Interim Committee. Mr. Marshall proposes the establishment of a Standing Committee of the General Assembly under the title of the "Interim Committee on Peace and Security," which would pay constant attention to the work of the General Assembly and its continuing problems. In spite of the reservations in the United States proposal to the effect that the Committee would not impinge on matters which are the primary responsibility of the Security Council or its special commissions, there is not the slightest doubt that the attempt to create an Interim Committee is nothing but a badly concealed scheme to substitute for and to bypass the Security Council. The functions of this Committee, whose task it would be to consider "situations and disputes that impair friendly relations" among nations, are nothing more than the functions of the Security Council as provided for by Article 34 of the Charter. Even by virtue of this situation alone these functions cannot be transferred to any other organ, no matter what its name is, without obvious and direct violation of the Charter of the United Nations; and of course the Soviet Delegation can in no way accept it and will energetically oppose it. (Applause.)

I repeat that, if the above-mentioned new proposals, as well as the old ones in a new form, are submitted to the General Assembly by the United States delegation, the Soviet Union delegation reserves its right to make a more detailed and more elaborate analysis of these proposals at the time when the substance of these questions is examined, and will insist upon the rejection of these proposals, which are in disagreement with the principles, purposes and tasks of the United Nations Organization and the adoption of which could only undermine the very basis of the United Nations.

VII

The Propaganda of a New War and the United States of America

The Soviet Union delegation believes it necessary to raise before the General Assembly a very important question concerning measures against the propaganda of a new war steadily increasing in a number of countries.

More than two years have passed since the Charter of the United Nations was signed at San Francisco and ratified subsequently by 52 nations, which marked the beginning of activity of a new international association that sought as its task to ensure the peace and security of nations and the development and strengthening of

international cooperation, in order to promote the economic and social progress of nations.

The creation of the United Nations dates back to the period when the principal enemy of the democratic states — Hitlerite Germany — was defeated and the day of the defeat of Japanese imperialism was near. The attempt of those enemies of mankind to establish their world domination was a complete failure because of the historic victory of the democratic states, headed by the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition. Two primordial hotbeds of war were destroyed. We wish to be sure that they are destroyed forever, that the task of complete disarmament of Germany and Japan set forth by the Allies will be brought to an end, and that those states will never again threaten freedom-loving nations with war and aggression. We wish to be sure that the severe lesson given to the aggressive states during the Second World War has not passed away leaving no traces, and that the fate of the severely punished aggressors of the last war will serve as a stern warning to those who, disregarding their obligations to develop friendly relations among the nations and to strengthen peace and security in the whole world, are preparing both secretly and openly for a new war. A war psychosis which is instigated by the efforts of the militarist and expansionist circles of certain countries — the United States occupying the foremost place among them — is continually spreading and assuming an all the more threatening character.

A furious campaign in the press, mainly in the United States press and in the press of the countries obediently following the example of the United States, like Turkey, has been spread for a considerable time for the purpose of coaxing world public opinion in favor of a new war. All means of psychological influence have been used — newspapers, magazines, radio and films.

This propaganda of a new war is being carried on under various flags and pretexts. But no matter how much the flags and pretexts differ, the essence of the whole propaganda remains the same: to justify the furious armament race which is being carried on by the United States, including atomic weapons; to justify the limitless desires of the influential circles in the United States to fulfill their expansionist plans, the keystone of which is a senseless idea of world domination. Torrents of the propaganda of a new war and appeals to prepare for it better and more expediently flow from the pages of the press of the United States.

A number of newspapers and magazines, mostly American, cry every day and in every way about a new war, systematically promoting this baneful psychological coaxing of the public opinion of their countries. The war-mongers indulge in propaganda under a smokescreen of cries about the strengthening of national defense and the so-called necessity to fight against a war danger which allegedly comes from other countries. The war-mongering propagandists try by hook and crook to frighten people poorly versed in politics by fables and vicious fabrications and slanders about alleged preparations on the part of the Soviet Union to attack the United States. They certainly know only too well that they are telling lies and slanders, that the Soviet Union is not threatening in any way an attack on any country; that the Soviet Union is devoting all its forces to the cause of rehabilitation of the areas that either were destroyed by the war or which suffered general damage in the course of the war; that the Soviet Union is devoting all its efforts to the cause of rehabilitation and further development of its national economy.

The war-mongers and propagandists active in the United States and in the United Kingdom, Turkey and Greece, and in some other countries as well, are well aware of the fact that the whole population of the Soviet Union — workers, peasants, intellectuals — condemn unanimously any attempts to bring about a new war, and such a thing is impossible in the Soviet Union. (Applause.) The Soviet Union is engaged in the work of peaceful reconstruction, is peacefully laboring, having much to do in the field of rehabilitation of areas damaged by the war, and in that of

strengthening and further development of its national economy which suffered from the heavy blows of the war imposed upon the Soviet Union by the Hitlerite bandits. There is no place in the Soviet Union, the land of socialist democracy, the land of peaceful construction of a new life, for anything even of remote likeness to what has taken place in some countries which consider themselves to be democratic and progressive, and at the same time, allow such shameful performances as war propaganda and poisoning of public opinion with the venom of hatred and enmity toward other nations. Should any person in the Soviet Union make a statement, even in infinitesimal degree resembling the above-mentioned statements which are full of criminal greediness for a new manslaughter, such a statement would meet with a severe rebuff and public disapproval as a socially dangerous act leading to serious harm.

Nevertheless, the gentlemen who make their profession the baiting of the Soviet Union and other democratic eastern European countries, and the baiting of consistent democrats and antagonists of a new war in other countries as well, never lack false and slanderous insinuations manufactured by these provocateurs and war-mongers and spread all over the world through numerous information channels.

They stubbornly preach that a new war is inevitable and even necessary, under the pretext that it is necessary to forestall the alleged aggressive policy of the Soviet Union and other eastern European countries. Really, this is to lay the fault at another man's door. Truly, as a Russian proverb says; though it is he who flogs, he cries out in the pretense of pain. (Applause.)

The preparation for a new war is being carried on literally before the eyes of the whole world. The war-mongers and propagandists now do not even try to conceal it. They openly threaten the peace-loving nations with war, trying at the same time to shift on to them the responsibility for the creation of a new hotbed of slaughter.

As one can judge by a number of signs, the preparation for a new war has already passed the stage of sheer propaganda, psychological coaxing and war of nerves. Numerous facts prove that in some countries — and this is particularly the case in the United States of America — the war psychosis is being warmed up by putting into effect practical measures of a military and strategic character, together with such organizational and technical measures as the construction of new military bases, relocation of armed forces in accordance with the plans of future military operations, expansion of manufacture of new armaments, and feverish work for the purpose of improving existing weapons.

Simultaneously, military blocs, military agreements on so-called mutual defense are being formed and concluded, measures for the unification of armaments are being elaborated, and the general headquarters plans for a new war are being worked out. The American journalist Leon Pearson, in a recent broadcast, had reason to admit that "American military officers slowly and carefully are preparing for the next world war, in which the enemy will be Russia."

This is the way in which the war-mongers and propagandists of a new war are acting. Being afraid of a new crisis, they are instigating a new war, expecting to remove by such means the approaching menace of collapse and loss of their profits.

The instigators of a new war are stirring up a crazy plan to put under their domination by means of armored fists the countries that struggle for their independence and reject the of other powers to interfere with their internal affairs and try to dictate to them the canons of both foreign and home policy.

The war-mongers calling for a new war and inciting their partisans against certain

powers expect to achieve their ends through a local war. Apparently they do not take into account the experience of the past wars, which teaches us that nowadays any new war inevitably becomes a new world war. They forget the fact that a new world war, with all its insane destruction, ruin of many cities, extermination of millions of people and the vast material values accumulated through human labor, will crush upon mankind as a new immense disaster and holocaust and throw mankind many decades back.

War as a Source of Profit of American Monopolies

The most active role in the promotion of this propaganda is assumed by the representatives of American capitalist monopolies, by representatives of the largest enterprises and the leading branches of American industry, by representatives of banking and financial groups. These are the groups that have received from the Second World War great profits and accumulated vast capital, as was the case in the First World War.

Comparing the five previous years, 1935 to 1939 inclusive, with the five years of the Second World War, 1940 to 1944, inclusive, we find that the profits of all American corporations for the five prewar years amounted, after payment of taxes, to 15.3 billion dollars, and for the five years of the Second World War those profits amounted, after payment of taxes, to 42.3 billion dollars. According to the data of the Department of Commerce the net profit of those corporations for six years of the war — 1940 to 1945 inclusive — amounted to 52 billion dollars. The basis on which those profits were built was human blood, ruined cities and millions of widows and orphans who bewail their lost bread-winners.

The bulletin Economic Outlook published by the Congress of Industrial Organizations, Number 11, 1946, gives interesting data about the increase of profits, after payment of taxes, of 50 companies during the years 1945-1946. It can be seen from these data that individual monopolies received exorbitant profits from the war, having pocketed 200-300 and more per cent; in some cases these profits amounted to 500 and even 800 per cent. (Atlantic Sugar Refining Company, for instance.)

According to this bulletin these profits exceeded four times the average profits for the period 1936-1939. As far as the commercial profits are concerned, they reached in October, 1946, the highest peak in their history, according to the statement by John Steelman, Director of the Board of Economic Stabilization.

Thus, in certain countries, the war is not so hateful after all to those groups of society which skillfully utilize the hardships of wartime for the purpose of their own enrichment. Therefore, it is not by accident that James Allen in his book International Monopolies and Peace states that in capitalist countries economy suffers so-called "loss of balance" and "radical disruption," and quotes from the report of a governmental body engaged in the research of this particular problem some extracts which lead to the conclusion that "only under the conditions of war is the modern economic system able to secure approximately full employment." Any comments on this frank confession are hardly needed. It speaks eloquently for itself.

It should be noted that the capitalist monopolies, having secured a decisive influence during the war, have retained this influence on the termination of the war, skillfully utilizing for this purpose governmental subsidies and grants of billions of dollars, as well as the protection which they enjoyed and are still enjoying from the various governmental agencies and organizations. This is facilitated by the close connection of the monopolies with senators and members of governments, many of whom often are either officials or partners in the monopolistic corporations.

This situation affects also the industrial scientific-technical activity concentrated in the laboratories of various large corporations.

The same can be said with regard to the research field in the use of atomic energy. Such capitalist monopolies as Dupont chemical trust, Monsanto Chemical Company, Westinghouse company, General Electric, Standard Oil, and others are most closely connected with this research work, being complete masters in the field. Before the war they maintained the closest cartel connections with German trusts, and many cartel agreements contained a clause to the effect that there would be a renewal of the exchange of information after the termination of the war.

All these facts suffice to explain the extreme interest of the various capitalist monopolies in the manufacture of atomic weapons. One can find in these facts an explanation for the stubborn resistance to the justified demands to outlaw the manufacture of atomic weapons and destroy the stock of atomic bombs, in the manufacture of which tremendous sums are invested. The rush for profits on the part of the capitalist monopolies, their endeavor to maintain by all means and to develop further those branches of war industry which yield large profits, cannot but influence foreign policy, strengthening militaristic, expansionist and aggressive tendencies to satisfy the ever-increasing appetite of the influential monopolistic circles.

Who is Inciting the New War?

Such is the soil in the United States of America that feeds the propaganda of a new war. The promoters of this propaganda are not only prominent representatives of American influential industrial and military circles, influential organs of the press and prominent politicians, but also official representatives of the American Government as well. It is by no means accidental that the particularly violent war-mongers among them are those who are closely connected already with commercial, industrial and financial trusts, concerns and monopolies. There is no need to name too many names; it is sufficient to name some of them, having in view certainly not their personalities, personal convictions, personal merits, and so on, but mainly those social groups, enterprises, industrial, technical and scientific societies and firms whose views and interests these persons represent.

1. Dorn, Member of the House of Representatives. On May 7 when the House of Representatives discussed the proposed relief assistance for the Greek and Turkish Governments, he made a cynical statement worthy of an experienced war-monger to the effect that "the Soviet Union cannot be halted by four hundred million dollars." "But this can be done," he said, "with the aid of a big air force and the bombing of potential industrial centers of the Soviet Union, the Ural Mountains industrial area, and other vital places." This was said from the floor of the House of Representatives of the United States of America by a man who considers himself to be a representative of the people of the United States of America.

2. Jordan, the President of the National Industrial Conference Board. He made a slanderous statement concerning the Soviet Union. According to Jordan, the above-named Jordan, for whom the sky is the limit, the United States of America should manufacture many atomic bombs and quickly release them whether there is or is not any reason to believe that the country concerned is manufacturing armaments.

3. Earle, a former United States Minister in Bulgaria, who was testifying before the Committee on un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, stated in a provocative manner that the United States of America should immediately use atomic bombs against the country which refuses to agree with the American draft inspection system. Frightening his listeners with stories of Soviet "reactive bombs released from submarines," he insisted that "the most terrible weapons should be secretly

perfected," and that "the Russians should be informed that when the first atom bomb is dropped on us" (the United States of America) "we will destroy every village in Russia."

4. Eaton, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, published in the American Magazine an article in which he stated that "we are still able to block Russia psychologically; if we fail in this we should rout Russia by the force of weapons . . ."

Where has it been said? It has been said in the American Magazine. By whom has it been said? By the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. What kind of a policy can one expect from such a Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs? (Laughter, excitement in the audience.)

5. Senator McMahon, former Chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, stated in Congress that the "United States should be the first to drop atom bombs if the atom war is inevitable."

In another speech of his, McMahon stated that, should the negotiations on international control over atomic energy fail, there are four possibilities left for the United States: first, to accumulate a tremendous stock of atom bombs; second, immediately to begin the war; third, to set up an international control authority without participation of the Soviet Union; fourth, to fix a date for the coming into force of international control and declare that any country refusing to recognize it is guilty of "aggression."

6. Senator Brooks, from Illinois, in his speech in the Senate on March 12, 1947, did not hesitate to declare quite cynically that had the United States listened to the advice the Republican Party offered before the war, and "had the Germans eaten up Russia," the present Truman program would have been unnecessary. He added that in wartime the United States rendered assistance to the Soviet Union, and now, said Brooks, the United States might be compelled to wage war against the Soviet Union.

7. General Deane, the former head of the United States Military Mission in the Soviet Union, writes in his book that the United States military program should be designed to meet specialized situations which war with the Soviet Union would entail.

8. Harwood, Vice-President of the industrial firm of Cutler-Hammer, Incorporated, according to the Milwaukee Journal, said that the atom bomb is a poor weapon because instead of exterminating human beings only it destroys excessive amounts of property as well. This Mr. Harwood cynically said at the conference of the American Inter-Professional Institute of Milwaukee: "Though it sounds cruel, still the type of weapon we should possess if we are to wage war is such a one that will kill only human beings. Such a weapon will eliminate during the next war the necessity to rehabilitate countries and material property on such a broad and expensive scale."

9. Finally, I must name a name which is well-known to all of us, Mr. John Foster Dulles (excitement in the audience) who in a speech delivered on February 10, 1947, in Chicago urged a tough foreign policy toward the Soviet Union, declaring that if the United States of America does not take such a course, counting on the possibility of reaching a compromise with the Soviet Union, then war is inevitable. In the same speech Mr. Dulles boasted that since the collapse of the Roman Empire no nation ever possessed such great superiority of material power as the United States and urged the United States to utilize this power to promote its ideals. This is good advice indeed, from a member of the United States delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations. (Laughter, applause.)

The meaning of these statements is clear — in some cases they are open and in some cases they are poorly camouflaged instigation for war against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This is a provocative attempt to divert attention from the true warmongers and to camouflage their war-mongering activities with slanderous demagogue about a “social revolution in the whole world,” and other rot, expecting the simpletons to believe it.

Such are the new war inciters from the ranks of American politicians, who do not hesitate to disseminate slanderous attacks on the Soviet Union and to fan the embers of hatred toward the Soviet Union, but also suggest systematically the alleged inevitability and necessity of a new war, thus systematically acting as war-mongers and propagandists of a new war. Their statements do not differ from those made by such one-hundred-per-cent reactionaries as the notorious American Legion, at a recent convention of which some of the participants, being in a state of war intoxication, shouted that “nobody should labor under the false impression that America is not going to raise the sword if circumstances demand it.” The war psychosis — the war intoxication — is doing its business, spreading its baneful influence.

Numerous organs of the American reactionary press, which are in the hands of such newspapers magnates as Morgan, Rockefeller, Ford, Hearst, McCormick and others do not lag behind the reactionary political statesmen who busy themselves with war-mongering. As is known, Morgan controls the following magazines: Time, Life, and Fortune, published by the well-known publishing corporation. Time Incorporated, the largest shareholder being, by the way. Brown Brothers, Harriman and Company.

It is well-known that the richest American capitalists own or control large organs of the press — magazines, newspapers, bulletins; they have their own publishing houses inundating the book market with specific publications. By the order of their bosses all these publications are waging sharp propaganda for unleashing a new war, using all possible insinuations and forgeries fabricated in a certain way with the view to provoking hatred toward the Soviet Union and other Eastern European nations of a new democracy. Provocative appeals for an attack on other nations which allegedly threaten the security of the United States are being daily trumpeted from the pages of these newspapers and magazines, although these organs of the press, as well as their bosses, are well aware of the fact that nobody is going to attack the United States and that there exists no danger whatsoever for the United States in this respect.

It cannot be but mentioned as an example that sub-organs of the press as The New York Herald Tribune and a number of other similar organs, especially of the Hearst press, publish systematically all possible provocative articles which promote in the minds of their readers the necessity for “military action if Europe faces collapse or falls under the control of the Soviet Union.” There is no small number of statements of this kind. But the main thing to be pointed out is not the fact that such statements take place, but the fact that they do not encounter the necessary rebuff, thus only encouraging further provocations on their part.

All this press is entirely in the hands of the bosses of various newspaper enterprises and does what is ordered, claiming their literary exercises to be the expression of public opinion and presenting the picture in such a way as if they were the mouthpiece of the feelings, aspirations and cravings of the American people. It may be said with confidence, however, that the American people, as well as the peoples of the other democratic countries, are against a new war while the scars made by the last war have not yet healed on their bodies. But in most cases it is impossible for the people to speak of their needs and wishes in books, magazines and newspapers published in millions of copies. This, of course, facilitates the work of the propagandists and instigators of a new war who take advantage of their privileged

position against the interests of peace-loving peoples.

I cannot but add a few words with regard to the propaganda of a new war on the part of various scientific institutions and universities in the United States. In this connection, one cannot but mention the works recently published by Yale University under the title *The Absolute Weapon*, in which a group of scientists, speaking of the atomic weapon and the control of the use of atomic energy, found nothing better than to come to the conclusion that "the most effective existing means of preventing war is the ability to launch atomic war literally in no time."

Under the mask of scientific objectivity, this book treats different variants of atomic war, and says that if the United States air forces "succeed in using bases in northern Canada, the towns of the Soviet Union will be within a much shorter distance," and thus "it will be possible to destroy, operating from their own bases, the majority of the large cities of any other power."

What is that other power?

It is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

These are the hopes of the honorable Yale scientists, as expressed in a book published in the United States under the title *The Absolute Weapon*.

In this book, dedicated to the so-called "absolute weapon" (the atomic bomb), a group of American authors are busy with suspicious speculations that "unless we" (that is, the Americans — A. V.) "can strike first and eliminate a threat before it is realized in action — something which our national constitution obviously forbids — we are bound to perish under atomic attack."

These gentlemen are ready, in other words, to sacrifice the Constitution of the United States in order to attack and drop atomic bombs first, even while nobody in the world is prepared to drop atomic bombs on the United States. That there is no such plan is very well known to the authors of this false and slanderous book, but it is profitable for them to speak of it. The hired writers of lies are spreading the lie all over the world in millions of copies because such is the order given by the monopolies who hold within their grasp all the media of information.

Under the mask of various "scientific" considerations, this book speaks about the danger "of one-sided actions on the part of this or that great power," and says that if "one-sided actions" are taken in the future, they are to be expected mostly on the part of the Soviet Union. From this speculation comes the provocative conclusion that "serious danger toward the United States lies in the fact that without due warning from our side" (that is, on the part of the United States) "the Soviet Union might, one fine day, begin war against us."

The extracts I have mentioned alone from this book are sufficient to make it clear how varied, in the United States, are the forms and methods of propaganda for a new war directed first of all against the Soviet Union.

How far has gone the propaganda for a new war, accompanied by demands for the production of the deadliest types of weapons, might be seen from the report published in the magazine *Chemical and Engineering News*, of Mr. Merck, where in the section under the title "Science and Civilization," all the deadly advantages of bacterial warfare are openly advocated. Just the same direction is also taken in an article in the *Army Ordnance*, concerning a new toxin, the development of which, according to this magazine, cost 50 million dollars, which expenses, however, to use

the author's words, "are fully justified," because one ounce of this toxin is quite sufficient to kill 180 million people.

When reading all this so-called quasi-scientific literature, one feels what a satanic energy is being developed by the war-mongers and propagandists of a new war in order to create a suitable atmosphere capable of poisoning the people's minds with war madness.

What kind of mood is being created in public circles by such propaganda, spread all over the world by the reactionaries and felt especially in the circles of United States influence, might be seen from an article by Vernon Bartlett, a British journalist, who published it in early August of this year in the London newspaper News Chronicle. In this article, one may read the following noteworthy lines: "From the moment a person, going to the zone controlled by General MacArthur, reaches Okinawa on his way to Japan, he is thunderstruck by the tone of the American newspapers speaking of the Soviet Union. Certainly an American soldier is not to blame if, after the reading of these newspapers, he comes to a conclusion that war against Russia is probably a matter of months."

Mr. Bartlett continues: "The Japanese would be fools if they did not notice this almost hysterical attitude."

This information coincides with the material in the journal Newsweek, which published an article of the editor of the foreign section of this magazine, Mr. Kern, who recently returned from Japan. Mr. Kern says that in Japan the American generals are systematically agitating the Japanese militarists in the direction of the inevitability and necessity of war against the Soviet Union. Mr. Kern writes that a considerable number of Japanese kamikaze fliers, who came to the American airdromes, stated their readiness to participate in the new war against the Soviet Union which they heard and which they believed to have already started. Mr. Kern mentions the fact that the Japanese would probably welcome the possibility of fighting the Russians, and that the Japanese Army, supported by the United States, could perhaps "conquer Russian Asia" east of Baikal. Mr. Kern added that "the United States domination on the seas would make it possible to land at almost any point and Japan herself would be out of danger under protection of superior American air and naval forces. These threatening strategical facts explain why Russia's absence at the Peace Conference on Japan would never be felt."

These facts explain many other things, and they explain why every decent human being must blush for shame. (Applause).

Thus for a long time in the United States of America war propaganda has been systematically carried on, with the following main trends:

1. Fear of the Soviet Union, as a mighty power allegedly seeking world domination and preparing an attack on the United States of America, is propagated and inspired in every way. While doing so, slanderous fictions and provocative attacks of all possible kinds are used against the Soviet Union most shamelessly.
2. Open propaganda is being carried on for the increase of armaments and further perfection of atomic weapons, while any attempt to limit or to prohibit the use of atomic weapons is rejected.
3. Statements openly calling for an immediate attack against the Soviet Union are made, using provocative intimidations with the military strength of the Soviet Union on the one hand, and stressing the necessity of taking advantage of the present situation when, in the war-mongers' opinion, the Soviet Union is weak militarily, not

having fully recovered after the Second World War.

Thus we have a shameless propaganda of fear against the power of the so-called Polar Bear, the Soviet Union; and on the other hand it is stated that the Polar Bear should be taken fast while he is not yet strong enough and while his wounds are not yet healed.

4. The war-hungry psychosis is stimulated in every way among the American public, excited and fanned by militarist and expansionist circles of the United States of America.

American progressive persons are aware of this situation and are making efforts to expose the preparation for war, which is now carried on in America, and to sober the minds of those affected with a war madness. These progressive persons in the United States of America and the progressive elements of the American press expose the military preparation which is carried on in the United States, instigated by military groups and various reactionary organizations.

For example, Kingdon, the President of the organization of the Progressive Citizens of America, stated on this matter in the New York Times that in the center of all this propaganda are militaristically minded persons who occupy high posts in the War and Navy Departments, Representatives and Senators, leaders of monopolies and certain representatives of religious circles who lend an ear to war cries. It is said further that the war party hopes that it would be possible to fabricate some incident and to use it as an excuse for atomic bombing.

The American magazine The American Mercury, in its issue of last February, analyzed the project of the American Army which is preparing itself for the third world war. It is stated in the article that, "Industrial preparedness is the keystone of Government planning in Washington today Avith a view to the possibility of a third world war." Since this conclusion has been made by such military authorities as Patterson, Royall and other leaders of the American Army, this article, therefore, becomes of special significance.

From the above, it follows quite obviously that American reactionary circles who reckon only with their own selfish interests and are ready for the sake of these interests to plunge humanity into a new exterminating Arnold Avar, are the main inciters in the field of propaganda and instigation of a new war.

The American reactionaries, however, are not alone in these efforts of theirs. They are supported by their adherents in some other countries who are busy knocking together military-political and simply political Western, Northern and other blocs. In this connection it is deemed necessary to mention the statements made by certain British politicians who, it is true, are acting not so resolutely as their United States adherents, but mostly in an underhanded way — yet in the same alarmist spirit.

Everybody remembers Churchill's speech at Fulton, Missouri, where speaking of "general strategic conceptions," as Churchill called his main utterances, the former British Premier performed "a dangerous act calculated to sow the seeds of discord among the Allied governments and to hamper their cooperation," as was justly stated by Generalissimo Stalin in this connection, stressing that, "There is no doubt that the setup of Mr. Churchill is a setup for war, a call to war with the Soviet Union."

We all remember Churchill opposing the United Nations as an association of nations speaking various languages, with an association of English-speaking nations, thus associating himself with Hitler, who started launching the war by "announcing his racial theory, declaring that only those people speaking the German language

represent a fully valuable nation." (Stalin).

Churchill now says that only people who speak the English language are nations in the full sense of that term.

We remember many other things in that speech in which Churchill resorted to insinuations and slander against the Soviet Union.

Churchill the father is echoed by his son who beat the record of war instigation in his statement made at Sydney on September 3.

The family utterances of the Churchills by themselves would be of little interest to anybody, but they are an indicator of that black work which is being carried on in certain British circles against the cause of peace and which is directed to organizing a new war, no matter whether it is in the form of repeating Churchill's military crusade against Russia or in any other form; the form is not important.

In this connection one also ought to point out the fact that the Anglo-American Combined Chiefs of Staff in Washington are continuing to function. It is known that Great Britain is represented on the Combined Chiefs of Staff by the military mission headed by General Morgan, and that the United States is represented by a military mission headed by Admiral Leahy. This Anglo-American Combined Chiefs of Staff was set up to coordinate military operations against Germany and Japan and still continues to exist, and it is not known for what purpose, in spite of the fact that the war ceased two years ago.

There is no need to recapitulate numerous facts of quite an unbridled, slanderous and provocative campaign, a campaign which goes beyond the limits of the admissible and of warmongering against the Soviet Union, and which has been carried on for a long period of time in Turkey. The reactionary press of Turkey is trying to keep in step with the reactionary press of the United States. A Russian proverb tells of a lobster following a horse and trying to make claw prints to match the horse's hoof prints. The Turkish press day after day disseminates dirty slanders about the Soviet Union, which allegedly intends to seize Turkey (newspaper Aksham), and is making provocative prophecies that "the United Nations will try to inflict the decisive blow upon Russia from the shores of the Black Sea" (newspaper Democracy Iksan). The Turkish press is instigating the Turkish people to prepare for war and is simultaneously praising the military power of the United States of America, stating that it must necessarily enter into war against the Soviet Union.

The notorious Junhuriyet, in an article by one Daver, states with cynical frankness that, "The only way out which may put Moscow on the right road is war." In Uluse, he is echoed by the Deputy Atai, Editor-in-Chief of this paper, who states that, "The time has already come for America and England to take more decisive measures."

Yalchin, the Editor of Tanin, who is famous for his provocative activities, is not far behind them. Last September he wrote that the time had come to invite the Russians for frank talks, having hung the atomic bomb over the conference table. He demanded that an ultimatum be sent to the Russians, stating that, "They would be subjected to a shower of atomic bombs if they did not agree to the establishment of a new international order." The same Yalchin wrote recently that it was only possible to speak the language of ultimatum with Moscow, and asked for the "uniting of the whole world against Russia." The language of ultimatum of which Yalchin dreams is the language familiar to all of us: the language of the United States "tough policy."

The same provocative appeals are voiced by other mercenary scribblers, such as Adviz from the reactionary Turkish paper Ergeneckon, Professor Likhat Erim, Deputy

and member of the Foreign Commission of the Mejlis, and some others.

This provocative hubbub is vigorously supported by the Greek reactionary papers, in particular by the *Ellinicon Etna*, which recently published an article stating: "Let the Russians not forget that the main source of Russian petroleum in Baku is as on a saucer within only a hundred kilometers of the Turkish border." All this goes unpunished before the eyes of the whole world. Such are the plottings of enemies of peace instigating a new war for the sake of their own selfish interests and war profits, bringing new perils and calamities to mankind. There is no doubt that this campaign of instigating a new war meets with rigorous and resolute condemnation on the part of millions of people.

The Proposals of the Soviet Union

The Government of the Soviet Union feels that the conscience of the nations who carried the whole burden of the recently terminated Second World War, who paid for that war imposed on them with their own blood, suffering and ruins, cannot reconcile itself with such a state of affairs.

The delegation of the Soviet Union, on instruction of the Government of the Soviet Union, declares that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers as a matter of urgency the adoption by the United Nations of measures directed against the propaganda of a new war; propaganda which is being carried out at present in some countries, and particularly in the United States of America. To this end the Soviet Union delegation suggests that the following resolution be adopted:

1. The United Nations Organization condemns the criminal propaganda of a new war which is being carried on by reactionary circles in a number of countries, particularly in the United States, Turkey and Greece by means of spreading all kinds of insinuations through radio, press, cinema and public statements and which contains an open appeal for an attack on peace-loving democratic countries.
2. The United Nations Organization considers the tolerance, and more so the support, of such propaganda of a new war, that would inevitably be transformed into a third world war, as a violation of the obligations undertaken by the members of the United Nations Organization, whose Charter provides for an obligation "to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace" so "that international peace and security and justice are not endangered." (Article I, Paragraph 2; Article II, Paragraph 3.)
3. The United Nations Organization considers it necessary to urge the governments of all countries on pain of criminal punishment to prohibit war propaganda in any form whatever and to take measures for the prevention and suppression of war propaganda as a socially dangerous activity threatening the vital interests and welfare of the peace-loving nations of the world.
4. The United Nations Organization reaffirms the necessity for the speediest implementation of the decision of the General Assembly of December 14, 1946, with regard to the reduction of armaments and the decision of the General Assembly of January 24, 1946, on the exclusion from national armaments of atomic weapons and all other principal types of weapons designed for mass extermination, and considers that the implementation of these decisions meets the interests of all the peace-loving nations and would be the heaviest blow upon the propaganda and the instigators of a new war.

Generalissimo Stalin, in his welcome to Moscow, on the occasion of celebrating the

eight hundredth anniversary of the foundation of Moscow, indicated that Moscow was the herald of the fight for peace and friendship among nations and the herald of the struggle against the inciters of a new war. These words of the great leader of the Soviet people found a profound reaction in the hearts of all the peoples of the Soviet Union and, we believe, in the hearts of all common, honest, progressive people throughout the world.

The Soviet people will not spare any efforts in order to settle successfully this great problem. {Prolonged applause.}