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all the peace-loving
This task, needless to say, was not an easy one. It is not always easy to
and politically, in the course of a period that has elapsed since the
the Fifth Session of the Assembly.
Mr. President, Messrs. Delegates:

I avail myself of the opportunity of discharging the pleasant duty of greeting from this rostrum, on behalf of the delegation of the Soviet Union, the freedom-loving French people, who are for the second time hospitably receiving our Assembly here.

At present the United Nations Organization is confronted with a number of important tasks which call for very thorough attention on the part of the Assembly and on the part of all peace-loving states. The delegation of the Soviet Union is fully aware of this, bearing in mind the responsibility borne by the United Nations for the way that will be chosen for the accomplishment of these tasks and for the way in which these tasks will be accomplished. The Soviet delegation now, as at the previous sessions, sees its task as the directing of the Assembly's efforts toward the elimination of the obstacles which hamper the strengthening of peace and international cooperation and toward the removal of the menace of another world war. At present this is the most important and primary task which calls for an immediate decision on the part of the United Nations. We are convinced that there is no other task whose successful accomplishment is so eagerly awaited and demanded by millions and millions of people, by all the peace-loving peoples.

This task becomes all the more important, for the international situation has become even more complicated, both economically and politically, in the course of the period that has elapsed since the Fifth Session of the Assembly.
During this time the economic situation in the capitalist countries has deteriorated still further as a direct result of the aggressive policy of the Atlantic bloc, headed by the United States, and also of a number of other countries which are compelled to pursue such a policy under constant pressure on the part of the United States of America. The United States economy at present has assumed an unhealthy military-inflationary nature, being characterized by a steady growth of armaments production with a simultaneous curtailment of the civilian industries. The armaments drive entails the growth of military budgets as well as the growth of direct and indirect taxes, even further worsening the material conditions of the population of those countries. Not an insignificant role in the deterioration of the international economic situation has also been and is being played by the policy of discrimination toward the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies in the sphere of economic and, primarily, trade relations, a policy inflicting serious damage on world economy, not excluding the United States of America itself and, to an even greater extent, Great Britain and France.

Many leading personages in these countries are themselves compelled to admit the serious deterioration of the economic situation in capitalist countries.

Thus, as regards the United States, such an admission has comparatively recently been made by the United States President, Mr. Truman, in whose economic report to Congress for the first six months of 1951 it is stated that inflation in the United States, in the course of the past year, has resulted in the rise of prices on primary necessities, "encouraged speculation and put heavy burdens," as Mr. Truman said, "on many of our people. Those fortunate enough to have rising incomes were able to maintain their living standards. But more than half the families of the Nation had no income gains between early 1950 and early 1951, and almost one-fifth suffered actual declines." Yesterday Mr. Truman was again compelled to admit, and the same has been confirmed today by Mr. Acheson, that the possibility of improving the life of the population depends directly upon decreasing the burden of armaments. However, this admission, as is known, does
not prevent the United States Government from going on with a frenzied armaments drive, which worsens the material conditions of the people still further.

As regards the economic situation in the West European countries and, specifically, in Great Britain and France, this can be judged, for instance, by the conclusions of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, about which one can read in the September issue of *New Statesman and Nation* that in the United Kingdom "the economy is showing every sign of suffering from severe strain. Cost inflation is rampant, and towards the end of the year may well be enhanced by demand inflation flowing from the heaviest rearmament program in Europe."

The economic and, in particular, the financial position of Great Britain and the West European countries will be faced in the future with serious difficulties, especially in connection with the new American law, signed by the President on last October 26, envisaging that United States policy will consist in placing an embargo on goods exported to the Soviet Union and countries friendly toward it, and in discontinuing economic and financial aid to the countries trading with the Soviet Union and countries friendly toward it.

In this connection mention should be made of the article by the present Foreign Secretary of Great Britain, Anthony Eden, in the American magazine *Foreign Affairs* for April 1951 in which it was stated: "It must be remembered, however, that the British economy is already fully stretched, with a higher level of taxation than any other country in the world." Even more definite in this regard was the program speech of the new British Prime Minister, made in the House of Commons only two days ago, in which, according to official organs of the press, Mr. Churchill said:

"In overseas payments we are in a deficit crisis worse than 1949, and in many ways worse than even 1947 . . . In the present half-year, we are running into an external deficit at the rate of 700,000,000 pounds a year compared with an annual rate of surplus of about 350,000,000 pounds in the same period a year ago. That means a deterioration of more than one billion pounds a year.

"The latest estimates show that in 1952, on present trends and
policies and without making any allowance for further speculative losses, the United Kingdom would have a deficit on its general balance of overseas payments of between 500,000,000 and 600,000,000 pounds, and the loss to the central gold and dollar reserves in the transactions of the sterling areas as a whole with the rest of the world might be appreciably more. These figures mean, in short, that we are buying much more than we can afford to pay for from current earnings, and this can only in time lead to national bankruptcy.”

Even more difficult is the economic position of the underdeveloped countries. In connection with the militarization of the United States, Great Britain and a number of other countries, these underdeveloped countries are denied the possibility of obtaining equipment for the development of their own industry. Their proceeds from sales of raw materials are frozen in American, British and other banks and they cannot use them freely. The agriculture of these countries is in a state of decay and shows no signs of progress in the future. The output of foodstuffs is decreasing, and in a number of places the population is doomed to starvation, disease and extinction.

The political situation, too, has become more complicated in the past year. The Anglo-American aggressive Atlantic bloc brought about a further deterioration of international relations among countries which are put to serious trials under the pressure of the unbridled war hysteria, the armaments drive, and the attempts to intimidate other nations with atom and hydrogen bombs, with which the American reactionary leaders are constantly threatening.

The United States and Great Britain, which head this bloc, have been waging an aggressive war in Korea for almost a year and a half.

Mr. Acheson made an attempt to relieve the United States Government, which has unleashed this aggressive war, of the responsibility for the war in Korea by repeating the already exposed slander about aggression from North Korea. There is no need to dwell on this now. As regards the negotiations in Kaesong of which Mr. Acheson also spoke, can there be any doubt indeed
that it is precisely the Messrs. American generals—the MacArthurs and the Ridgways—and their Washington protectors, who are stubbornly thwarting all attempts of the other side to achieve success in these negotiations? Is it not the American Command that hampers the progress of the negotiations by all sorts of delays, bombings of the neutral zone and similar methods of so-called "negotiations" in the course of which, for example, the absurd demand that the Kaesong area, which is in the hands of the North Korean troops, be handed over to the American troops was recently put forth on the pretext of an adjustment of the line of contact of troops.

Can it be doubted that the best way to secure a favorable outcome of the armistice negotiations in Korea would be an order of the American Government to its General Ridgway not to encumber the negotiations with all kinds of incidents, not to create artificial obstacles to a positive consummation of the negotiations in Kaesong? The United States has seized the Chinese island of Taiwan and is threatening China's frontiers. Efforts are now being made to reinforce the North Atlantic bloc by including in it Greece and Turkey as well as West Germany, to which countries a special role is assigned in the implementation of the aggressive plans against the Soviet Union. The representatives of the Atlantic bloc openly violate the international agreements, concluded during the war against Hitlerite Germany and militarist Japan, aimed at combating the danger of recurrence of fascist aggression and at strengthening friendly relations with the Soviet Union. Thus, the ringleaders of the North Atlantic bloc are in a hurry to clear the way for the realization of their aggressive plans, drawn up in the offices of the general staffs on the command of the United States reactionary circles, thirsting for another world war. In order to deceive public opinion and to camouflage their actual aggressive aims, the President, the Cabinet Members, Senators and other political and public leaders in the United States are raising a hue and cry about the threat to United States security emanating from the USSR. With this end in view they are trying to make use also of the recent test of the atom bomb in the USSR, tests of different sizes of which, as J. V. Stalin said in his reply
to a Pravda correspondent concerning the atomic weapon, shall be carried out in the future as well, in conformity with the plan for the defense of our country against attack by the Anglo-American aggressive bloc.

In his reply to the Pravda correspondent, J. V. Stalin exposed the utter groundlessness of this alarm pointing out that there is no basis for this alarm.

"United States leaders," J. V. Stalin said, "cannot but know that the Soviet Union is not only opposed to the employment of atomic weapons, but is in favor of having them banned and their production discontinued" and that "if the United States is not thinking of attacking the Soviet Union, then the alarm of the United States leaders must be regarded as baseless and false, since the Soviet Union has no intention of ever attacking the United States or any other country."

In its hostile policy toward the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, the Atlantic bloc, under the pressure mainly, in these cases again, of the United States, is trying to make use also of the United Nations by imposing on the General Assembly and other United Nations bodies decisions canceling the rulings adopted at the previous sessions of the Assembly. With a view to eliminating the threat of another war and assuring the peace and security of nations, at the Fifth Session of the Assembly the delegation of the Soviet Union pointed out that the Assembly was thus violating the basic principles of the United Nations and insisted on the adoption of the proposals submitted by the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, aimed at strengthening peace, at prohibiting — I stress — not at the reduction of which Truman and Acheson speak, but at prohibiting, completely and unconditionally, the atomic weapon and establishing strict international control over the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, and at prohibiting war propaganda. The Soviet delegation at the same time insisted that the Assembly pass decisions on the immediate cessation of the war in Korea, thrust on the Korean people by the American-British interventionists, on the cessation of aggressive actions toward the People's Republic of China and on a number of other important questions.
The General Assembly unfortunately did not follow this course. On the contrary it embarked on a course of further digression from the principles and purposes of the United Nations. The previous session adopted a number of decisions whose aggressive nature cannot be doubted, despite all the efforts of the authors and inspirers of these decisions to cover up their actual plans with high-sounding phrases about "united actions for peace," "peace calls for deeds," and so on and so forth. The decisions of the Assembly on the so-called collective measures, on the introduction of a blockade and the placing of an embargo on goods exported to China, the ignominious decision on proclaiming the People's Republic of China an aggressor, and the no less infamous decision making it incumbent upon the American Command in Korea to assure a "stable situation" throughout Korea, in other words to continue the aggressive war until the whole of Korea is completely conquered, all these decisions speak for themselves. By adopting such decisions the Assembly has openly taken the path of supporting and encouraging aggression against the peace-loving peoples of Korea and China. Almost on the eve of this session the majority of the Security Council, on the order of the United States and Great Britain, permitted another violation of the major principles of the United Nations Charter by accepting for consideration the British complaint against Iran in obvious violation of Paragraph 7 of Article 2, which does not allow intervention in the internal affairs of states. Once again the Anglo-American grouping in the United Nations has demonstrated its complete disregard for the major principles of the United Nations Charter, which demands respect for the independence and sovereign rights of states.

It is sufficient to recall the above-mentioned facts to have no doubt that the elementary principles and standards of international law are being trampled upon in the United Nations, that the American policy in the United Nations is inflicting tremendous damage on the moral prestige of the United Nations.

Instead of solving important tasks, promoting the establishment of conditions necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations, raising the living standard, ensuring full employment,
etc., the Economic and Social Council has been fully engrossed in elaborating measures designed to facilitate Anglo-American aggression in Korea. At the Eleventh Session, the majority of the Council, on the order of the United States, adopted a resolution on so-called "aid" to and "rehabilitation" of Korea, specially designed to cover up with hypocritical and false phrases the barbarous destruction of Korean towns and villages by the American air force and the annihilation of the peaceful Korean population. The Economic Council also followed the same direction at the Twelfth Session, taking all measures to support the American aggressive policy in the economic spheres as well. At the same time the majority of the Economic Council systematically blackballed all the proposals directed at developing a peaceful economy and at meeting civilian requirements. The Economic Council rejected the proposals on measures for curtailing war industry and increasing the output of civilian industry, for lowering the prices of goods of mass consumption, for reducing the taxation of the population, for increasing the appropriations for housing construction, public health, education, and so on and so forth. It voted down all the proposals directed toward helping the maintenance of peace and security, improvement of the living standard of the population and economic development of the underdeveloped countries.

In the regional economic commissions the Anglo-American bloc rejected a number of important, constructive proposals which were made by the delegation of the USSR and the delegations of the People's Democracies and which envisage the promotion of the development of economic relations among the countries and territories of Asia and the Far East, the promotion of the development of national industry and trade, of the rehabilitation and development of agriculture in these countries and territories, and a number of other important proposals. Thus, from year to year, the United Nations, step by step, departs more and more from the principles of the Charter, from the aims and tasks set before the United Nations. It has strayed far from the path of strengthening peace and promoting the development of friendly relations among countries. It is guided now by other interests. It is being impelled
toward other aims by aggressive forces in the United States, Great Britain, France, and in the Latin American countries, which are now deciding matters of war and peace in the United Nations. These aims and interests are the craving for a new war, the craving to fatten on another war, to make huge profits on war. Herein is the source of inspiration of the gentlemen monopolists who regard "war as an item of income which gives colossal profits" as the head of the Soviet Government, J. V. Stalin, has said.

The aggressive aspirations and plans of the American monopolists are supported by a number of states — members of the North Atlantic bloc — which have the upper hand in the United Nations, which is turning from an instrument of peace into an instrument of war.

"Thus, being turned into the tool of aggressive war," J. V. Stalin has said, "the United Nations Organization is at the same time ceasing to be a world organization of nations enjoying equal rights. As a matter of fact, the United Nations Organization is now not so much a world organization as an organization for the Americans, catering to the needs of the American aggressors."

Such are the facts. And facts are known to be stubborn things. This path must not be followed any longer.

It is time for the United Nations to recall its basic tasks — not to support aggressors attacking other countries, but to support those who are being attacked by aggressors, to support international peace and security, and to develop friendly relations among nations.

It is time to give a rebuff to the aggressive forces which are pushing the world toward another world war.

* * * *  

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

In the United States influential statesmen — the President, Members of the Cabinet, Senators — day in and day out incite enmity for the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. Their Congress heaps one law upon another, directed at disrupting peaceful cooperation among nations, at kindling another world
war. Only this year the United States Government, following the path of further worsening relations with the USSR, has adopted a law placing an embargo on trade with the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, and has abrogated the Soviet-American trade agreement of August 4, 1937. One cannot but note that this decision of the United States Government was taken almost simultaneously with the message of Mr. Truman, President of the United States, and the United States Congress to N. M. Shvernik, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and to the Supreme Soviet, which contained assurances of the striving to improve relations with the Soviet Union. It must be said outright that such statements in no way tally with the deeds of the United States Government and, specifically, with the abrogation of the above-mentioned trade agreement with the USSR, which cannot be regarded otherwise than as an act directed at further worsening Soviet-American relations.

The aggressive nature of the United States foreign policy is clear to the entire world, despite the efforts of the American Government to conceal this from the world public, presenting the new war it is preparing as a defensive war and presenting the peaceful policy of the USSR and other peace-loving countries as an aggressive one, although it is known to all that the Soviet Union, as I have already said, citing the authoritative statements of Generalissimo J. V. Stalin, does not contemplate ever attacking the United States or any other country.

The United States is increasing its army, navy and air force from year to year, is building hundreds of new naval and air bases on foreign territories, is establishing a whole system of military alliances bringing countries of the former "axis" — Japan and Italy as well as Western Germany — into these alliances.

The entire economy of the United States, as well as of Great Britain, France and of a number of other countries, is geared to war. The lion's share of expenditures in state budgets goes for war preparations. Military expenditures in the budget of the United States in the fiscal year 1951-1952 comprise, according to official American data, 81.8 billion dollars, i.e., 76 times more than in 1939.
According to the admission made by Mr. Truman in a message to Congress last April, during the preceding 10 months the United States more than doubled the numerical strength of its armed forces and was planning to increase them further the next fiscal year — up to 3,500,000 men, not counting 2,000,000 men in the various military reserve formations and in the national guard units. Thus, the numerical strength of the armed forces of the United States, Great Britain and France is now already several times greater than their armed forces were before the Second World War in 1939, and more than twice as large as the numerical strength of the armed forces of the Soviet Union. Nevertheless the armed forces of these countries are being increased more and more.

The United States continues to expand its war industry, which is absorbing ever more billions of dollars, covering this up with references to the interests of the "defense" and of the "national security" of the United States.

The American ruling circles try to present the armaments drive, the formation of numerous armies, the production of atom bombs and the establishment of military bases in foreign lands as a necessity, allegedly springing from the danger threatening the United States, Great Britain or France. It is for such a deception of their peoples regarding the true nature of the policy of the Atlantic bloc that the declaration of Great Britain, France and the United States submitted to the General Assembly is intended. From this declaration the clear conclusion can be drawn that these states will continue the armaments drive, the production of atom bombs, the barbarous aggressive war in Korea — and again using the interests of alleged defense and alleged desire to strengthen the security of nations as a smoke screen for all this. In so doing, they try to prove that peace can be preserved only by relying on a powerful war machine, on force, and that only on this condition can the existing differences in foreign relations be settled.

This is the main thesis of American "total diplomacy," which Mr. Acheson again expounded here so zealously, repeating Mr. Truman's speech delivered over the radio yesterday. Again there is the boasting of successes in the armaments drive, in expanding
the so-called combined armed forces in Europe under the command of General Eisenhower. Promises are made to continue expanding and increasing the armed forces and armaments, as Mr. Truman said, in Europe and in other parts of the world, no matter how much time it may take, this time too covering up the aggressive plans by false phrases about a "strong military defense" against the alleged threat on the part of the Soviet Union.

This is a repetition of the rather old slander on the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union in order to deceive their peoples and involve them in another world war which is being organized by the United States ruling circles. How many times have attempts been made to resort to such deception in order to strengthen their own position and continue their line of aggressive policy!

This is an expression of the very same policy of the "situation of strength," the entire recklessness of which is now already clear to every sensible person, notwithstanding all the artifices of the sponsors of the plans for another world war in order to dupe the trusting people.

This "total diplomacy" has, however, already proved its utter bankruptcy.

Even in the United States this "theory of strength" no longer enjoys the attention it did formerly. And if now the proposal is put forth and talk of peace is flying around, this is due exclusively to the pressure of the powerful movement of the masses of people who are demanding peace and who have already affixed more than 500,000,000 signatures to the new Appeal concerning the necessity of concluding a Pact of Peace. Voices of dissatisfaction with the policy of the "situation of strength" resound more and more frequently and loudly in broad public circles of the United States; one hears with increasing frequency such statements as, that if America stubbornly refuses to conduct negotiations and insists only on a still more frenzied pace of rearmament, this will have disastrous consequences both for the United States and for its allies.

The entire foreign policy of the United States is based on preparation for another world war with the object of gaining world domination for American monopolies and making gigantic
profits on war. It is for this reason that the foreign policy of the United States is directed not at developing and strengthening friendly relations with the other countries and international cooperation, but at subordinating the other countries through economic enslavement or military coercion.

Of late the United States, Great Britain and France have been making fresh efforts to expand the conspiracy against peace, to draw Western Germany, Italy, Turkey and Greece into the preparation for another war.

It is no secret to anyone that the United States is the main organizer and moving spirit of such measures as the "Pleven Plan" and "Schuman Plan" which pursue a common aim—the restoration of German militarism and the war industrial might of Western Germany and the utilization of the regular German army and of the country's economy for aggressive ends. This is the reason the United States, as well as Great Britain and France, following it unquestionably, has disrupted the conference of Deputy Foreign Ministers in Paris on the German question. Vain are the efforts of Mr. Acheson to whitewash the United States and its accomplices' policy of boycott during the almost four months of marking time in Paris at the conference of Deputy Foreign Ministers on the German question. Facts testify against Mr. Acheson. Facts testify against such an attempt; facts show that it is precisely the Anglo-American bloc that has made every effort here again to frustrate and, having successfully fulfilled this work, has frustrated this conference. Having disrupted the Paris conference of Deputy Foreign Ministers, Acheson and his followers arranged their conference in Washington in September and then held a meeting of the North-Atlantic Alliance Council in Ottawa in order to consolidate and continue to proceed with the further remilitarization of Western Germany, with the conversion of Western Germany into a bridgehead for attack on her neighbors.

As in the period preceding the Second World War, American gold has already for several years, since the end of this war, been flowing again in a broad stream into the German war industry in order to place it at the service of the American
monopolists, who are craving for more and more profits, even at the price of inflicting great calamities and sacrifices on all mankind. What the aim of the United States policy toward Japan is and what it leads to can be seen without any explanation from the farce of signing the so-called peace treaty with Japan, staged under the direction of the United States in San Francisco. This treaty fully contradicts the principles upon which a real peace treaty should be based, a treaty that could ensure peace in the Far East and provide a guarantee against the recurrence of Japanese aggression. Not only the Government of the United States, but also the Governments of Great Britain, France, Canada, Australia and certain other states that signed the San Francisco treaty violated the commitments they had assumed in 1947 as members of the Far Eastern Commission in the decision on the basic policy for Japan. This decision declared that the above states undertake to carry out reforms in Japan in order to eliminate the militaristic influence, effect complete disarmament and deprive Japan of the opportunity to wage aggressive wars in the future.

Instead, the initiators and inspirers of the so-called peace treaty with Japan have taken the path of reviving all kinds of militaristic organizations, of establishing and expanding military, naval and air bases in Japan; they have taken the path of restoring the Japanese army, navy and air force, the path of securing Japan as an American arsenal and springboard in the Far East.

Such a so-called peace treaty with Japan is incompatible with the interests of the peace-loving peoples and the interests of the Japanese people themselves. Having imposed on Japan the obligation to join the military grouping spearheaded against her neighbors, first and foremost against the Soviet Union and the People’s Republic of China, this treaty dooms the Japanese people to the bitter lot of cannon fodder in the new war which the aggressive Atlantic bloc is preparing. This is a dangerous step in international relations, a step undermining the cause of peace and security of the nations in the Far East. It is also dangerous because the San Francisco treaty preserves the occupation of Japan by American
troops even after the peace treaty is signed and also imposes on Japan the obligation to permit her territory to be used for American military bases. The San Francisco treaty is not a treaty of peace, but a treaty of preparation of another war in the Far East.

The San Francisco treaty hinders the Japanese people from democratizing their country and interferes with the development of the civilian economy in Japan. It leads to the conversion of Japan into a country dependent on foreign monopolies; it prevents the Japanese people from improving their welfare and hampers the development of their material and intellectual forces.

As a matter of fact, the inspirers of this treaty—the Anglo-American monopolists—did not even strive for such a goal. They needed such a treaty only to legalize the road to a military alliance between the American monopolists and the Japanese militarists. It cannot and will not serve the cause of peace. Rejected by the Soviet Union and also by the People's Republic of China, India and Burma—the countries most interested in a peaceful settlement with Japan—it will always remain a dead letter.

* * * *

The basis of the present foreign policy of the United States is the fear of a possible peaceful development of international relations and of the strengthening of international cooperation.

It is frankly admitted in United States “business” circles that fear of the “danger of peace” prevails there, that, as repeatedly stated in the American press, the price of stocks goes up on the American Exchange when a continuation of the war in Korea looks probable and, on the contrary, falls when a prospect for the establishment of peace arises.

Having launched the aggressive war in Korea, which brings them enormous profits, the American billionaires and millionaires are holding on tightly to this source of income and have no desire to let go of this “golden opportunity” of multiplying their millions and billions. They meet every hint at the possibility of an armistice in Korea with alarm, doing everything to wreck the negotiations in Kaesong even though the American people,
like all the peace-loving peoples, thirst for and demand the cessation of the war and the establishment of peace in the Far East.

It was openly stated in the July issue of the bulletin published by the American First National Bank of New York, controlled by the Morgan group, that any reduction in expenditures on armaments will complicate the monopolists' position.

At one of his numerous press conferences, United States President Truman declared that the armistice in Korea might cause a delay in the implementation of the American arms program and that this would be the most disastrous thing that could happen in the United States.

At a conference of bankers in Los Angeles, Edward Rubin, President of the large investment company, Selected American Shares Incorporated, openly said that if peace were attained, it would be difficult to imagine what would replace the defense program as the prop of the United States economy.

This is the reason that the Soviet Union's proposal for a cease-fire in Korea caused serious alarm in the ruling circles of the United States. In an effort to influence American public opinion accordingly, Wilson, head of the American office of mobilization for so-called defense, alleged in a radio broadcast on July 9 of this year that our proposal for an armistice in Korea was a maneuver designed to slacken the vigilance of the United States and prevent the fulfillment of the USA defense program, i.e., in other words, of its military program for the implementation of American aggressive plans. In the same speech Wilson expressed confidence that Congress would not take such a, as he put it, dangerous course. The path of peace is a dangerous one for Mr. Wilson.

Do not all these facts sufficiently prove that the real direction of United States foreign policy is aggressive, that its purpose is not the maintenance of peace, but the instigation of another world war regardless of the fresh disasters and rivers of blood it will cost mankind?

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union is a policy of peace. (Prolonged applause.) The Soviet Union indefatigably strives
to eliminate the threat of war, strives for peace, for strengthening friendly relations among the countries, for close international cooperation based on mutual respect for the independence of nations and the sovereign equality of states.

When almost 20 years ago diplomatic relations were resumed between the USSR and the United States, J. V. Stalin called it an act of tremendous significance: "Politically," J. V. Stalin said, "because it improves the chances of preserving peace; economically, because it does away with extraneous elements and enables our countries to discuss matters which interest them on a businesslike basis; finally, it opens up the road for mutual cooperation."

These words of the Soviet people's leader express the most important principles of Soviet foreign policy pursued by our Government with regard to all countries. The Soviet Union invariably adheres to these principles, which determine the whole direction and every step taken by the Soviet State in international affairs.

Pursuing its peaceful policy the Soviet Union employs all its resources not to increase its armed forces or to carry out an armaments drive, not to expand war industry and not to organize military bases on foreign territories, but to develop civilian industry to the utmost and to further advance the entire national economy.

Successes achieved in the rehabilitation and development of the postwar economy have enabled the Soviet Union to start the implementation of a great task—the task of the extensive complex utilization of the Volga, Don, Dnieper and Amu Darya rivers for the power, agricultural, transportation, and other needs of the national economy. The great projects which the Soviet Union has already set about carrying out—the Kuibyshev, Stalingrad and other hydropower stations, the Main Turkmenian, South Ukrainian and other canals—are widely known. The new power plants will produce 22 billion kilowatt-hours of cheap electric power annually which, as the Vice-Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR L. P. Beria pointed out in his report, is equal to the entire annual production of electric power in Italy;
the new irrigation systems will make it possible to irrigate and water more than 28 million hectares of land, which is equal to the area of several European states. The object of these great projects is to advance further the peaceful economy of our country, to raise the standard of living of the Soviet people still more. The Soviet Union is investing thousands of millions of rubles in the aforementioned great projects.

In the Soviet Union the entire nation is engaged in constructive labor, directing all its energies toward a further development of the national economy and attaining ever new achievements in the further progress of culture, engineering, science and art.

In its foreign political relations with other countries the Soviet Union stands for friendly cooperation, opposes all kinds of discrimination, all kinds of artificial barriers which hamper free association of the Soviet people with other peoples, and stands for the friendship of nations.

Throughout all the years of the work of the General Assembly, the Soviet Union has been striving from year to year for the adoption of measures which would strengthen peace and international security. It is sufficient to recall that as early as in 1946 the Soviet Union submitted a proposal for a universal arms reduction and the prohibition of the manufacture and utilization of atomic energy for military purposes. Despite the Anglo-American bloc’s resistance to these proposals, the General Assembly nevertheless adopted these proposals of the Soviet Union in the main. Throughout all the subsequent years this bloc hindered the implementation of these decisions in every possible way.

At later sessions, from 1947 to 1950, the Soviet Union demanded the prohibition of the atomic weapon, but invariably encountered the resistance of the North Atlantic bloc powers. The Soviet Union also repeatedly strove for the establishment of strict international control to ensure an exact and conscientious fulfillment of the decision to prohibit the atomic weapon and to utilize atomic energy for civilian purposes only. But in this case too the aggressive North Atlantic bloc invariably disrupted the Soviet Union’s proposals for international control and advanced its own proposals on international control which has nothing
in common with genuine international control. What it wants is not an international agency, but a United States agency, meant to legalize and legitimate the manufacture of the atomic weapon, and not to ensure that the decision prohibiting the manufacture of the atomic weapon, as proposed by the Soviet Union and as demanded by millions upon millions of people, as demanded by all the peace-loving nations, be fulfilled.

The true worth of the clamor raised in the United States and certain other Atlantic bloc countries in connection with the test of the atomic bomb in the Soviet Union should be clear to everyone in the light of these facts. Especially loud is the clamor raised by various leaders of the United States ruling circles who do not conceal their plans for using the atomic bomb against the Soviet Union. It is precisely they who are shouting the loudest, spreading slander that the Soviet Union is against international control over the fulfillment of the decision on the prohibition of the atomic weapon and alleging that the United States is for such control. In reality matters are just the opposite. It is precisely the Soviet Union that has striven all along and is striving for the establishment of effective international control to ensure the observance of the ban against the manufacture and utilization of the atomic weapon by all states without exception, whereas the United States has always opposed and continues to oppose the establishment of such control. As believers in the atomic weapon, the ruling circles of the United States want neither an unconditional prohibition of the manufacture of the atomic weapon, nor genuine effective international control. What they really want is to give the warmongers legitimate right, as J. V. Stalin told a Pravda correspondent in the reply to questions concerning the atomic weapon, to annihilate tens and hundreds of thousands of civilians with atomic weapons.

At the Fourth and Fifth Sessions of the General Assembly the Soviet Union submitted a proposal for the conclusion of a pact for the consolidation of peace by the United States, Great Britain, China, France and the USSR. More than 500,000,000 persons fervently upheld this proposal in all corners of the globe, and they continue persistently to demand the realization of this pro-
posal which inspires great hope for the elimination of the new war menace and for the consolidation of peace.

* * * *

Especially energetic efforts are now necessary to lead the world out of the dangerous situation into which it is being drawn by the criminal intrigues of the instigators of a new world war.

Faced with present international relations, the leaders of the aggressive Atlantic bloc had to advance their own plan for reducing the war danger and strengthening the security of all nations. This plan is the subject of the so-called tripartite declaration of the United States, France and Great Britain, which I have already mentioned, and also of Mr. Truman’s radio speech made yesterday, and today’s speech made by Mr. Acheson from this rostrum. Despite the broad advertisement which preceded these three declarations, it can be affirmed unerringly that the mountain brought forth a mouse (laughter in the hall), so insignificant and obviously false are the proposals emerging from the Atlantic camp.

What, indeed, is proposed to us as the most radical means for eliminating the threat of a new war and strengthening peace? Judging from Mr. Truman’s speech, it is proposed that an inventory of the armed forces and arms be taken under the direction of a new joint commission on conventional arms and atomic energy. They forget, however, that the peoples need not a list of arms, not an inventory of arms, not a list, not a registration of manufactured atom bombs, as Messrs. Truman, Acheson and the tripartite declaration now propose to us, claiming it to be a brand new plan for strengthening peace. The peoples need an effective, really substantial reduction of arms and armed forces, an unconditional prohibition of the manufacture of atom bombs and the establishment of strict, genuinely international control to ensure that such prohibition be observed. But this is precisely what the ringleaders of the Atlantic bloc, headed by the United States, do not want to allow.

In 1948 it was proposed that we collect information about
the armed forces and arms; this time it is an inventory of all the armed forces and arms and an inspection of the progress of this inventory that are suggested. It is suggested that as a result of the inventory we determine which arms and which armed forces each country has and will have in the future. As to such a weapon as the atom bomb, they continue to advertise the notorious Acheson-Baruch-Lilienthal plan whose entire untenability has already been exposed many times by those who are really striving for the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the establishment of strict international control to ensure that the decision on the prohibition be fulfilled. Neither Truman nor Acheson nor the authors of the so-called tripartite declaration want to lift a finger to prohibit the manufacture of atom bombs. Even more, the United States President and his Secretary of State continue to insist that the most suitable plan for the control of the utilization of atomic energy is the Acheson-Baruch-Lilienthal plan, which is a sheer mockery of international control and is the means of legitimizing the manufacture of atomic weapons.

They say that they will "insist," forgetting that this is an altogether unsuitable expression with regard to the Soviet Union. Need it be said that all such "plans" and all such proposals as those put forth in the tripartite declaration and defended here by the United States delegate, which are presented under the guise of peace proposals allegedly aimed at strengthening peace and eliminating the threat of a new war, are obviously playing on either the ignorance or the simplicity of people who are deeply alarmed about their future and the future of their children. The authors of these proposals declared with their usual brazenness, yesterday and today, that they insist that the Soviet Union accept these proposals, at the same time uttering slanderous lies concerning the iron curtain and other nonsense of that sort. But what is the value of these proposals which try to substitute mere chatter about a reduction of armaments for an extremely important and serious matter of making real efforts to eliminate the threat of a new war and to ensure the security of nations? What value can be attached to the entire affair expressed in the so-
called tripartite declaration, if in submitting their proposals on so-called arms reduction the authors of these proposals declare that as long as war continues in Korea and as long as the main political issues dividing the nations—I refer to the corresponding place from yesterday’s speech of the United States President—remain unsettled, real progress with regard to arms reduction is impossible? This characteristic remark fully exposes the true aims of the so-called “peace” offensive of the three Powers, headed by the United States of America, as aims having nothing in common with the cause of strengthening peace, as an obvious trickery, a juggling of words about peace in order to lull the people’s vigilance. Indeed, if the real issue is the strengthening of peace, then every sincere plan for a reduction of arms and armed forces should emanate from just as sincere a desire to terminate war in Korea immediately, for which termination proper measures should be taken. Yet the United States does not want to take any measures to terminate war in Korea because the United States millionaires and billionaires do not want it, since they are deriving fantastic profits from this war, from the war hysteria and from the armaments drive. Mr. Acheson permitted himself to repeat the disgusting slander about the violation of human rights in an extensive area of the world, as he put it, mentioning Hungary and Czechoslovakia. I shall not dwell on this matter specially, for slanders of this type, spread by the Acheson camp, have already been completely disproved many times. You, Mr. Acheson, talk about violation of human rights in other countries. I too should like to tell you what I read today in a French evening newspaper about an outrageous crime committed a few days ago in Florida when two Negroes—Samuel Shephard and Walter Irvin—charged by an American court with raping a white woman and acquitted by the United States Supreme Court because of an inordinate number of violations of the law during their trial—were shot before the eyes of all by the Sheriff of Eustis, Florida, after they were acquitted by the American Court, and a third Negro was shot by a policeman in the presence of the Sheriff.

At the same time racists burned down several houses in the
Negro quarter of Eustis where this tragedy took place. This incensed the American people so much that, according to press reports, the President of the United Automobile Workers of America, Walter Reuther, was compelled to say at the CIO Congress in New York: "But we know that in state after state in America that it has been the practice where Negroes come before the bar of justice there are two standards of justice, one for Negroes and one for white citizens." This is not an isolated fact. It is an illustration, and a very common one, of the American human rights, of the American way of life which we so firmly reject.

* * * *

W e spoke above of the immediate necessity of taking all measures to eliminate the threat of another war and to ensure the peace and security of nations.

It is necessary immediately to terminate the war forced upon the Korean people and to establish peace in Korea and other regions of the Pacific Ocean.

It is necessary to take immediate measures against the preparation of a new world war being made in certain countries and especially in the United States, Great Britain and also in France and other states belonging to the aggressive Atlantic bloc, membership in which is incompatible with membership in the United Nations.

It is necessary immediately to prohibit the manufacture of the atomic weapon and to establish strict international control ensuring the fulfillment of this decision, so that atomic energy and the atomic bombs already produced be utilized exclusively for civilian purposes.

It is necessary to terminate the armaments drive, to discontinue the establishment of military bases on foreign territories and to withdraw foreign troops therefrom.

It is necessary that all the states immediately take measures to reduce the armed forces and expend funds now used for military purposes on the needs of the people, to improve their living standard and ensure their well-being.
It is necessary that the United States, Great Britain, France, China and the USSR combine their efforts and conclude a Pact of Peace, urging all peace-loving nations to join it. Such measures should undermine the aggressive plans of the ruling circles of the United States, Great Britain and certain other states, and eliminate the threat of a new world war. (Applause.)

On instructions of the Soviet Government, the delegation of the USSR submits proposals which it is deeply convinced are an important means for achieving the goal which millions upon millions of people dream of, live and work for in all corners of the earth.

The Soviet delegation is certain that the struggle for peace will terminate in the complete victory of peace.

"Peace," as the head of the Soviet Government J. V. Stalin said, "will be preserved and consolidated if the peoples take the cause of preserving peace into their own hands and uphold it to the end." (Applause.)

The General Assembly should harken to the voice of the peoples and fulfill its duty in this great and noble cause.

On instructions of the Government of the USSR, with a view toward the strengthening of peace and security of nations and removing the threat of war, the Soviet delegation submits the following proposals for the consideration of the General Assembly:

"On Measures against the Threat of Another World War and for the Strengthening of Peace and Friendship among Nations"

"1. The General Assembly declares that participation in the aggressive Atlantic bloc, as well as the establishment by some states, primarily by the United States of America, of military, naval and air bases on foreign territories is incompatible with membership in the United Nations.

"2. The General Assembly considers it necessary that: a) the countries participating in the hostilities in Korea immediately cease fire, conclude an armistice and withdraw their troops from the 38th Parallel within 10 days;

"b) all foreign troops and all foreign volunteer units be withdrawn from Korea within three months."
"3. The General Assembly urges the governments of all states, both members of the United Nations and those not members of the United Nations at present, to consider at a world conference the question of a substantial reduction of the armed forces and armaments, as well as practical measures for the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the establishment of international control, to ensure that this decision be observed.

"To recommend that the aforementioned world conference be convened at the earliest possible date, and in any case not later than June 1, 1952.

"4. The General Assembly calls on the United States of America, Great Britain, France, China and the Soviet Union to conclude a Pact of Peace, uniting their efforts for the attainment of this lofty and noble goal.

"The General Assembly also calls on all other peace-loving states to join the Pact of Peace."

* * *

The Soviet Government believes that the adoption of these proposals, some of which have already been submitted by the Soviet delegation to the General Assembly, would be of great significance in the maintenance of world peace.

The delegation of the USSR expresses the hope that these proposals will meet with support on the part of all states which are striving for peace, on the part of all peace-loving peoples. (Prolonged applause.)
Mr. President, Messrs. delegates:

A NUMBER of highly essential questions have been touched upon by many delegates in the general discussion which is now ending in the General Assembly. These questions referred primarily to the speeches and proposals made by the delegations of the United States, Great Britain and France on the one hand, and by the delegation of the Soviet Union on the other. Notwithstanding the fact that these proposals were given considerable attention, not all the questions were elucidated in sufficient degree, and cannot by any means be considered exhausted.

We have already pointed out that these proposals of the three Powers, presented with much publicity as a reduction of armed forces and armaments including the atomic weapon, and allegedly designed to lessen the danger of war and strengthen the security of all countries, do not in their very substance live up to this publicity. It is not difficult to become convinced of this if one carefully analyzes the declaration of the three Powers containing these proposals.

In my first speech I naturally had no opportunity to subject this declaration to the fuller analysis it deserves. I limited myself to certain passing remarks. I will not conceal the fact that I also told the Assembly that this declaration really made me laugh.

If we take such an exceedingly important question as that of the prohibition of the atomic weapon, it turns out that the declaration makes no provision whatever for the prohibition of the atomic weapon, a fact which is absolutely impermissible. It is not fortuitous therefore that in Point 5 the declaration of the "Three" limits
itself to a passing remark that the so-called "UN plan for the international control of atomic energy and the prohibition of atomic weapons should continue to serve as the basis for the atomic energy aspects of any general program for the regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armaments and armed forces." But who does not know, gentlemen, that this so-called plan of control of atomic energy and prohibition of the atomic weapon imposed in the past by the United States on the majority of the member states of the United Nations, although it speaks of international control of atomic energy and of ensuring the prohibition of the atomic weapon by means of such control, in reality provides neither for the prohibition of the atomic weapon nor for international control over the implementation of such prohibition?

Has it been forgotten already that the American Atomic Energy Commission, which was presided over by Mr. Acheson, present Secretary of State, who to my pleasure is now here, and which had the cooperation of a Board of Consultants headed by Lilienthal, one of the authors of the "Baruch plan," and consisted of such noted specialists in the manufacture of the atomic weapon as Barnard, Oppenheimer, Thomas and others—that this commission, speaking of this plan of so-called international control to which the declaration of the Three now refers, pointed out as early as in 1946 that this plan did not require the United States to discontinue the manufacture of the atomic weapon even after the plan of international control came into force? Is this a fact or is this not a fact? I have not yet received any reply to this question. The American delegation — such eloquent representatives of the delegation as Mr. Austin, who is known always to speak on any subject, raising all sorts of objections — has made no reply so far. Perhaps this time they will answer at least under Article 74. I shall readily cede them my place here.

Perhaps they will answer the question as to the meaning of the memorandum signed by Mr. Acheson five years ago and addressed to Mr. Byrnes, Secretary of State at that time, which said that even after the plan of so-called international control would come into force the United States would by no means have to discontinue the manufacture of the atomic weapon and that everything
would still depend on ratification, political conditions and the international situation, which the United States Senate could not but take into account when it finally decided this question together with the House of Representatives.

Thus the plan to which the "Tripartite Statement" now refers, not only fails to provide for the prohibition of the manufacture of the atomic weapon but, on the contrary, reserves for the United States the possibility of continuing the manufacture of the atomic weapon even after the plan of international control comes into force.

This is known to be the characteristic feature of the "Baruch plan." Another distinctive feature of this plan is that it envisages such organization of the international control over atomic energy as would inevitably lead to the unlimited power of the American monopolists, who are thereby becoming masters of the entire world economy, including atomic energy resources. Thus this plan is not a plan of international control, but of American control, which has nothing in common with the tasks of a genuine international control agency. It is a mockery of control, to use the expression of the head of the Soviet Government, J. V. Stalin.

It is in place to recall here that this plan not only did not provide for the prohibition of the atomic weapon, but did provide — and this is something monstrous — that this so-called international control agency itself, which is charged with supervising that the decision on the prohibition of the atomic weapon be correctly, honestly and scrupulously observed, that this international control agency, set up just for this purpose, should have its own scientific research apparatus to study questions and problems devoted to the development of the atomic weapon and the use of the atomic weapon, as a number of American documents state. A spectacle worthy of the gods! An international control agency obligated to see to it that no one dares to manufacture the atomic weapon is being set up, and it is envisaged that this control agency should have a special research institute to carry on further studies of the possibilities for the further development of the atomic weapon.

And it is such a plan that is to serve as the basis for a general
program of armaments reduction, in part pertaining to the atomic weapon, according to the "Tripartite Statement." It goes without saying that the Soviet Union could not agree in the past, and cannot agree now, to a plan whose purpose, instead of to prohibit the atomic weapon, is to legalize the manufacture and use of this barbarous weapon of mass destruction of the people. It is, however, precisely this utterly unsatisfactory plan, unacceptable to any sensible person, that has been praised here both by Mr. Acheson and by Mr. Eden, who have tried to hold out as a lure the fact that among their proposals there is also one envisaging the inclusion of the atomic weapon into a so-called "system of disclosure and verification," alongside conventional armaments. Mr. Eden called this progress on the question of the atomic weapon, stating that if the three Powers had proposed nothing else but this, for these reasons alone their proposals would be worthy of study by the Assembly.

The point, however, is not the study of various proposals, the point lies in the contents of these proposals, in their value; the point is to find a really necessary, serious solution of this important and serious question. But there can be no serious solution of the question of the atomic weapon if no provision is made for the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon, which provision, however, is stubbornly evaded by the United States, Great Britain and France in their declaration.

In their declaration, the three Powers propose to take a decision regarding the presentation of information on armaments, having in view that this information will be submitted by stages, or, as the declaration says, "in successive stages."

Certain people, including the preceding speaker, General Romulo, are enthusiastic about this proposal. I, however, do not share his enthusiasm. I know that he is a real enthusiast, and that it is not very difficult to make him enthusiastic: it is enough for the proposal to come from the United States — then admiration is assured.

Regarding this proposal, Mr. Acheson said that "this system of disclosure and verification must be a system which progresses from stage to stage as each one is completed." Acheson continued, "the
least vital information would be disclosed first, and then we would proceed to more sensitive areas."

The same was confirmed by Mr. Eden in his speech of November 12. "We suggest," he said, "that this should begin with the less important categories of armed forces and armaments, and then move on to those that are more important and secret and therefore more difficult to handle."

But these "more important and secret categories," as Eden said, or "more sensitive areas," as Acheson put it, are precisely those ticklish questions which the three Powers refer to as the last stage, with the object of actually evading altogether the presentation of information about the atomic weapon, which weapon is known to belong to the most secret category, and which, to use Mr. Eden's expression, is more difficult to handle. Herein precisely lies the real meaning of the stage system invented by the three Powers, which is characterized also by the fact that the very transition "from stage to stage" will depend, as can be seen from the explanations of Mr. Acheson and Mr. Eden, on the discretion of those in whose hands the main levers of the so-called international control will land.

Mr. Acheson stressed that "in a world charged as ours is with suspicions and dangers, our peoples want the safeguards that disclosure and verification can provide" and that as "we move from stage to stage, we would have increasing evidence of good faith and honesty. We could not go forward without that evidence," Mr. Acheson said.

To put the question this way can only mean that transition from one stage to another in presenting information on armaments according to the plan of the three Powers will be made directly dependent on whether the results of the presentation of information demanded at the first stage are recognized as satisfactory by the states which possess more dangerous and more formidable weapons, information about which would have to be submitted at subsequent stages. This can only mean that those possessing more powerful and dangerous weapons would hold in their hands the destiny of the entire plan for collecting information on armaments, verification of this information and the implementation of
measures for the reduction of armaments. Lastly, this can mean that the solution of the question about the transition from one stage to another would also fully depend on these same powers, and consequently that these powers would have full opportunity not to permit transition from one stage to another should this prove against their interests.

It must be said right here that since the atomic weapon and other weapons of mass destruction are the most formidable and most dangerous weapons, the presentation of information about them and all attendant measures could be referred, at the arbitrary will of the possessors of these weapons, to the last stage, which in the final count might not be reached. Obviously, one cannot agree to putting the question in this way. Based on such a foundation, the program for the reduction of all arms in general is just as unacceptable as the similar system of stages underlying the "Baruch plan" for the control of the atomic weapon.

In the hands of the masters of the situation, to which role the United States lays claim, this "system of stages" would be a convenient way to evade for an indefinite time the implementation of undesirable restrictive measures of control as regards themselves and to carry out these measures unilaterally as regards others.

The system of stages in the "Baruch plan" for so-called international control pursued the aim of limiting international control merely to the first stage of atomic energy production, that is, to placing only the production of raw materials under control and not allowing the application of international control to subsequent stages in the manufacture of the atomic weapon. Under the conditions prevailing when the United States had a monopoly of the atomic weapon, this system of stages was very suitable for it in atomic affairs: it would have established control only over those who produced atomic raw materials but did not yet manufacture the atomic weapon, and would have relieved of all control those who were producing this atomic weapon. Now an attempt is made to apply such a system here as well, although the United States has lost its former monopoly position as regards manufacture of the atomic weapon, but it still hopes that with such a system it
will succeed in evading control of the manufacture of the most important weapons — atomic and other types of weapons of mass destruction.

We have already said that all these proposals of the three Powers actually boil down to a proposal for a census of armaments. But a proposal for a census of armaments which must be carried out without the preliminary adoption of a decision on the reduction of armaments and prohibition of the atomic weapon is designed to drown the main question — adoption of a decision on the reduction of armaments and prohibition of the atomic weapon — in talk about an armaments census.

It is self-evident that as soon as a decision on the reduction of armaments and prohibition of the atomic weapon is taken, all states must submit information about armaments in the shortest possible time.

As early as December 1946, at the First Session of the General Assembly, the delegation of the USSR submitted a proposal to recognize the necessity that all member states of the United Nations submit information about all their armed forces and armaments.

The proposals of the three Powers do not deal at all with the question of military bases of the states which are being established by the organizers of the aggressive Atlantic bloc on foreign territories, although the question of the reduction of armaments is closely bound up with this question. The reason these military bases cannot be ignored when armaments and armed forces are being discussed is that the military base is one of the forms, most dangerous for peace, of utilizing armaments and armed forces, especially when these bases are located on foreign territories. This is an important question, since the organization of army, naval and air bases by the United States on foreign territories is one of the important measures in the plan of preparing another world war.

According to figures published in the American press, which of course are far from complete and obviously understated, the United States has more than 400 military bases, predominantly air bases, on the territories of foreign countries.
Is it necessary to refer specifically to the indisputable fact that American bases form a chain designed to grip the Soviet Union and the People’s Democracies — from the north with the help of the Scandinavian countries, from the south with the help of Turkey and Greece, from the west with the help of the West European countries, from the east with the help of Japan, now being turned into a bridgehead, arsenal and fortress of the Atlantic bloc spearheaded against the Soviet Union and the People’s Republic of China? The same is attested to by all kinds of maps widely circulated by the warmongers giving the location of these bases, especially air bases, and showing the direction of blows which are to be struck from these bases at designated targets.

The role and purpose of the American bases can be judged also from the statement made by Churchill on November 9 to the effect that Britain had become the “principal atomic base for the United States.” It is seen from this statement of Churchill that this main American atomic base has been set up in conformity with the plan of the aggressive Atlantic bloc for purposes hostile to the Soviet Union.

Notwithstanding all the significance which military bases of different types have in the system of the armed forces of the aggressive Atlantic bloc, the proposals of the “Three” remain completely silent about this question.

In Truman’s statement, as well as in the statements of Messrs. Acheson and Eden and in the declaration of the three Powers, the proposal on measures for the reduction of armaments is accompanied by a number of reservations designed to prevent the adoption of practical measures for reducing armaments and prohibiting the atomic weapon. It is only in this way that all these reservations can be interpreted. In his speech of November 7 Mr. Truman, for example, accompanied proposals on the reduction of armaments, which properly speaking boil down to a simple census of armaments and armed forces, with the reservation that the path for reduction of armaments he proposed could become real only if a suitable international system existed, adding that it was necessary first of all for a reduction of armaments to have a “safe and fair procedure.” Mr. Truman did not explain exactly what
procedure he considered to be "safe" and "fair" for the realization of his proposals. (I am wondering whether a hint has not been cast here in direction of the veto, which they say makes unsafe both our organization and procedure. I think that this is so.) But it is already clear that so long as no procedure convenient and advantageous to the American monopolists is drawn up, the United States is not going to reduce armaments in any way.

We have already seen that Mr. Acheson, too, makes transition from one stage to another conditional upon growing proof of the good will of some or other states. As a preliminary condition for the reduction of armaments, Truman, Acheson and Eden put forth the demand for the elimination of existing international tension. This condition was also widely used by the leaders of the ill-famed League of Nations on all occasions when the question of the reduction of armaments and disarmament came up. One can recall that it was exactly such a condition that was put forth in the 30's, and in particular at the fourth session of the Disarmaments Preparatory Commission of the League of Nations by the well-known Paul Boncour when it was his task to disrupt the concrete proposals for disarmament put forth by the Soviet delegation at that time. His formula is well known: "first security, then disarmament." At the previous General Assembly sessions, opponents of armaments reduction simply repeated this formula. Now it has been somewhat modernized by Messrs. Truman, Acheson and Eden, who put forth a demand to eliminate present "international tension" as a preliminary condition for the reduction of armaments.

The falseness of the United States in putting the question this way is already seen from the fact that the entire policy of the United States is directed not at relieving tension in international relations but, on the contrary, at intensifying this tension still more. Indeed, is it not precisely this aim that is mainly served by the sally of the Titoite desperados, who made a provocative slanderous complaint against the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, a sally which, as is clear to all, would not have occurred but for the patronage and instigation — I will say it outright — of the United States? Could we be faced once more at
this session with the appearance of the representative of the bankrupt Koutmintang regime in the hall of the General Assembly, and even on its rostrum — the representative about whose speech one can use the wise French proverb, "Le mort saisit le vif" ("the corpse grips the live man") — if the figure of Mr. Acheson did not loom distinctly behind Chiang's back?

And these are not isolated facts. What about continued American attempts to torpedo the armistice negotiations, at first in Kaesong and now in Panmunjon? What about the Japanese treaty? The splitting of Germany? What about the attempts of the United States to set up or to expand bastions already built by it at Soviet frontiers in the north and south, in the east and west? What about the so-called "defense of the Near East," which the United States is so eager to "defend" without asking whether or not the countries of the Near East want it to do so?

For all his restraint, Mr. El Khouri could not but note that this rather resembles preparation for American intervention in the Near East.

What about the war in Egypt, which, as Mr. Salahudin, Foreign Minister of Egypt, has said, is now being waged against Egypt by a country calling itself her ally?

What about the Iranian events this year, of which Mr. Entezam, the delegate of Iran, has spoken, which have demonstrated the real meaning of the present policy of the United States and Great Britain toward countries weaker economically and militarily?

What about the fuss and bother over the armament and rearmament of Europe, which is still continuing and which even now is stifling quite a number of countries, not excluding Great Britain, one of the main initiators of this armament scheme, and France, one of the main echoers of these initiators? What is the meaning of this frenzied activity of the American headquarters of the Atlantic bloc, of this present rally in Paris of Atlantic bloc leaders, with the active participation of the United States Defense Secretary Lovett, General Bradley, and Mr. Harriman, not to mention Acheson, Perkins and Adenauer, as well as the Commander-in-Chief of the Atlantic armed forces, Eisenhower, and
others engaged in preparing the forthcoming session of the Atlantic bloc council in Rome on November 24?

The real meaning and importance of all such facts could not be concealed even by the Paris newspaper Le Monde, whose article in the issue of November 14 under the heading "With the American Army from the Atlantic Ocean to the Rhine" has considerable interest in the light of what has been said above. I will cite several quotations.

First. "At present more than 100,000 American soldiers and officers are located in France. This time they have not come to pay courtesy visits to Lafayette. Their aim: The American Army is setting up in the rear of the troops stationed in Germany stocks of war supplies and food necessary in case of conflict. This is the additional line which is projected from the Atlantic ports to the Rhine."

Second. "In the corridors of first-class coaches on the Limoges-Paris train one hears English of the kind which can be heard near the shores of the Potomac or Lake Michigan on the eve of weekends. In Chateauroux, in Orleans, trains are filled every week with more and more American passengers. Many of them have discarded their khaki uniforms or their blue air force uniforms in anticipation of week-end pleasures. All of them, however, carry military documents . . . What strikes tourists on French highways is not so much Packards and Chevrolets as canvas-covered gray-green automobiles and trucks. On all of them one can always read one and the same inscription: ECCZ, meaning European Command Communications Zone. Indeed, these machines belong to the armada which the Americans are gradually building up in the rear of the occupation forces in Germany."

Le Monde further remarks sadly that in all these activities the sovereignty of France is completely disregarded.

Are we not in the right, with the most patient attitude to such facts, to say clearly, firmly and resolutely: words to the effect that elimination of international tension must be the preliminary condition for the reduction of armaments are false from beginning to end? These words do not harmonize with the above phrases.
They contradict the deeds which make up the entire foreign policy of the United States.

After all, one cannot daily and hourly create more and more complications causing tension in international affairs and at the same time hypocritically call for the elimination of these complications.

Deeds are stronger than words. Words are judged by deeds. But words have never been believed unless they are corroborated by deeds.

Before us there is a crying divergence between the words that are being juggled by the leaders of the United States, who play a leading part in the aggressive Atlantic bloc, and their deeds. This divergence fully exposes the hypocrisy and false nature of the American, British and French proposals on the reduction of armaments, showing that this is a screen they want to use to cover up their real aims and further the armaments drive and the preparation of another war connected with these aims.

These reservations and the numerous other reservations scattered in the speeches of Messrs. Truman, Acheson and Eden and lastly in the declaration of the three Powers can be considered only as an attempt to prevent the adoption of practical measures for reducing armaments and prohibiting the atomic weapon.

This is manifested especially strikingly in the way Messrs. Truman, Acheson and Eden put the question of war in Korea. They consider the cessation of the war in Korea as an obligatory prerequisite to the reduction of armaments. All of them openly state that no general program of reduction of armaments and armed forces can be put into operation as long as the war in Korea continues.

But the United States should present such a demand to itself. By putting forth such a condition, the United States is simply playing the hypocrite.

This hypocrisy in the stand taken by the Government of the United States, as well as by the Governments of Britain and France, on the question of armaments reduction is obvious, because full responsibility for the barbarous war imposed on the Korean people rests precisely with the United States, Britain and France,
as well as with a number of other governments of member states of the Atlantic bloc—which fact certain representatives of the governments present here, and who spoke from this rostrum, fail to understand. It is the United States which started the war in Korea, and it is precisely the United States which must put an end to this aggressive war against the Korean people. When the demand to end the war in Korea is put forth by the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and France as a condition or obligatory prerequisite for the so-called system of armaments reduction it cannot be regarded otherwise than as an obvious mockery of the idea of peace, of the striving of millions and millions of people in all countries for peace.

This stand of the United States testifies stronger than any words that the United States actually does not want any reduction of armaments.

As for the stand of the Soviet delegation on the reduction of armaments, it has already been brought out with sufficient clarity. The delegation of the USSR insists on the need to begin reduction of armaments right now, irrespective of the continuation or discontinuation of the war in Korea. (Applause.) One cannot agree in any way with the precepts advanced by Truman, and then repeated by Acheson and Eden, that real progress in armaments reduction is allegedly impossible if it is not preceded by the end of war in Korea and if the main political issues dividing nations, as Mr. Truman said, remain unsettled.

If, indeed, the termination of war in Korea is a preliminary condition for reduction of armaments and prohibition of the atomic weapon, why then not take measures to have this war really stopped at once? Why in that case do Messrs. Ridgway and his allies on the Korean front in annihilating the peaceful population drag out armistice negotiations by the most incredible casuistry, as can be seen even from today’s press? Why?

Obviously, because it is necessary to delay the ending of the war in Korea. And the end of the war in Korea must be delayed in order not to reduce armaments and prohibit the atomic weapon.

It becomes perfectly clear from everything said above that the proposals of the three Powers are nothing but propaganda
maneuvers designed to use talk about armaments reduction as a screen for covering up the continuing armaments drive being affected by the organizers of the Atlantic bloc.

It is not accidental that even the American press had to admit that the plan of the three Powers for the so-called armaments reduction pursues only propaganda ends. In an article of the *New York Times* on this subject one can find an admission of the fact that one of the main reasons the American Government has presented a "disarmament" plan consists in the fact that at the recent session of the Atlantic bloc council in Ottawa the attitude of the American allies toward the United States assumed the form, as the *New York Times* put it, of a stubborn uprising against American rearmament plans, and that Western Europe was alarmed by the bellicose statements made of late by American representatives. It is for this reason, the *New York Times* writes, that it became necessary for the United States to stress its "peaceful intentions." The American plan is good for these propaganda purposes, the newspaper says, but it is unsuitable as a means of putting an end to the cold war.

The *Washington Post* also admits editorially that the "disarmament" proposal made by Mr. Acheson is merely "a propaganda gesture."

The *New York Herald Tribune* in an article published on November 9 stated that rejection of the plan of the Western Powers by the Soviet Union would be utilized by them in their campaign designed to shift the blame for the present armaments drive on the USSR, and that it was precisely this aim which American officials had in view when they started drawing up their plan many weeks ago.

Calling the American "disarmament" plan a chimera, the *Wall Street Journal* writes that by choosing the question of "disarmament" as a means for wresting the initiative from the Soviet Union, the United States had actually clutched at a straw, since this plan ignored reality in order to suit propaganda purposes.

It is characteristic that, while stressing that the first task confronting the United Nations consists of whipping into shape the plan of the Western Powers in order to demonstrate it to
the entire world, the *New York Times* asserts that the second task of the Western Powers is to proceed full steam ahead with their rearmament program.

One cannot neglect to mention also the assertions of the American press and a considerable part of the European press that proposals of the three Powers for the reduction of armaments came as a consequence of the fact that the idea of peace put forth by the Soviet Union and the part the latter plays as the champion of peace, in contrast to the Government of the United States as a warmonger, have proved effective. The Western Powers had to ponder over advancing their own proposals for reduction of armaments, with the object of winning at least the propaganda battle at the General Assembly, the *New York Herald Tribune* states.

This is how the matter stands with regard to so-called peace proposals of the three Powers. These proposals, as we have seen, evade the main problems demanding an urgent solution; namely, the prohibition of the atomic weapon and reduction of armaments. These proposals make an attempt to bring minor issues to the foreground and thus lead the General Assembly away from settling the above main problems.

The delegation of the USSR has already proposed to the General Assembly its positive program of measures to eliminate the threat of another war and strengthen peace and the security of nations. At the very beginning of our general discussion we submitted our proposals on this question, namely:

On the incompatibility of participation in the aggressive Atlantic bloc, as well as of establishment by certain states, primarily by the United States of America, of military bases on foreign territories, with membership in the United Nations;

On immediate cessation of hostilities in Korea, conclusion of an armistice, withdrawal of troops from the 38th parallel within 10 days and withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea within three months;

On convening a world conference for the reduction of armaments and armed forces and the prohibition of the atomic
weapon and on the establishment of international control over the implementation of this prohibition;

On the conclusion of a Pact of Peace among the five Great Powers—the United States of America, Great Britain, France, China and the Soviet Union.

In the development of the above proposals submitted on November 8, the delegation of the USSR, proceeding from the considerations outlined above, deems it necessary at present to introduce the following additional proposals:

1. The General Assembly, recognizing the use of the atomic weapon as a weapon of aggression and mass annihilation of peoples to be contrary to the conscience and honor of peoples and incompatible with membership in the United Nations, declares the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon and the establishment of strict international control over the implementation of this prohibition. (Applause.)

The General Assembly instructs the Atomic Energy and Conventional Armaments Commission to prepare and submit by February 1, 1952 for consideration of the Security Council a draft convention envisaging measures that ensure fulfillment of the decision of the General Assembly on the prohibition of the atomic weapon, the discontinuation of its production and the utilization solely for civilian purposes of atom bombs already produced, and on the establishment of strict international control over the implementation of the above convention.

2. The General Assembly recommends that the permanent members of the Security Council—The United States of America, Great Britain, France, China and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—reduce the armaments and armed forces which they will have at the moment of the adoption of this decision by one-third in the course of one year, counted from the date of adoption of this decision.

The representative of the Philippines said here absolutely incorrectly and distorting the facts, of course, that all have reduced their armed forces except the Soviet Union. He has forgotten, or has not read, certain official documents. I will not go into this aspect of the matter. I am prepared to postpone
detailed discussion for the first committee, but I will now say only that since the war ended we have demobilized 33 service age groups. It seems that Mr. Romulo is a general; he should understand what 33 service age groups means. If he understands it and if he knows it, he had no right whatever to say what he said here.

3. The General Assembly recommends that immediately, and in any case not later than within a month after the General Assembly adopts a decision on the prohibition of the atomic weapon and reduction of armaments and armed forces of the five Powers by one-third, all states submit full official data on their armaments and armed forces, including data on the atomic weapon and military bases on foreign territories. This data should be submitted as of the moment the General Assembly adopts the above decisions. (Applause.)

4. The General Assembly recommends the setting up of an international control agency within the framework of the Security Council, the function of which agency will be to control the implementation of the decisions on the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the reduction of armaments and armed forces and the verification of information submitted by states regarding their armaments and armed forces.

The importance of the above proposals is evident and does not require special elucidation. I deem it necessary to dwell only on our additional proposal for reduction by one-third of armaments and armed forces of permanent members of the Security Council, in connection with our proposal submitted on November 8 to convene a world conference for the reduction of armaments and armed forces. We consider it expedient and necessary that the General Assembly make a recommendation for the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of the atomic weapon in principle, while the world conference, with broader composition and with the participation of all states of the world, should examine concrete questions following from these recommendations and concerning all participants in the conference. I will remind you also that in the attempt to undermine our proposals for calling a world disarmament conference, certain delegates, including the head of
the Canadian delegation, Mr. Pearson, who is known also to be the chairman of the main council of the aggressive Atlantic bloc asked: Why wait until June? Is not the Assembly itself a disarmament conference?

Perhaps these delegates will now be fully satisfied that we do not postpone reduction of armaments until the world conference, but in addition to the proposal on the world conference for reduction of armaments we move that the already present Assembly should consider the question of reducing armaments of the five Powers by one-third and of prohibiting the atomic weapon.

We are firmly convinced that if the proposals on the regulation of unsettled international issues, on striving to end the aggressive American war in Korea, on reduction of armaments, etc., are not talk but really express the striving of the United States, Great Britain and France—these three Powers that play the leading role in the Atlantic bloc and whose behavior determines the political atmosphere in the governmental circles of a number of other states—then the path for taking serious and responsible decisions will be really opened before the General Assembly. We are firmly convinced that the proposals of the Soviet Union enable the General Assembly boldly and resolutely to follow this path. (*Pro-\textit{longed, loud applause}.*)
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