

**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE 473rd**

MEETING

Thursday, 20 December 1951, at 10.30 a.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
Complaint of aggressive activity and interference in the domestic affairs of other countries, by the United States of America, as instanced by the appropriation of one hundred million dollars to finance the recruitment of persons and the organization of armed groups in and outside the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Albania and other democratic countries (A/C.1/685) <i>(continued)</i> .....	107

*Chairman* : Mr. Finn MOE (Norway).

**Complaint of aggressive activity and interference in the domestic affairs of other countries, by the United States of America, as instanced by the appropriation of one hundred million dollars to finance the recruitment of persons and the organization of armed groups in and outside the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Albania and other democratic countries (A/C.1/685) *(continued)***

[Item 69]\*

GENERAL DEBATE *(continued)*

1. Mr. WIERBLOWSKI (Poland) said that for the first time in the history of international relations a Power was adopting financial measures for purposes of subversive action in the territory of other Powers. The United States representative's statement at the preceding meeting that his Government's intention of changing the structure of another State did not constitute intervention in the second State's domestic affairs amply substantiated the complaint of the USSR.

2. Act 165 adopted by the United States Congress, by legalizing the organization of armed groups of traitors, sapped the very foundations of the United Nations. The Act organized the recruiting of nationals of the USSR and the peoples' republics and incorporated them into armed units in the service of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Those units were of an aggressive nature and the intention was to use them in a fratricidal war. The United States representative's arguments that the law was of a humanitarian character was therefore completely groundless. It should be recalled in that connexion that the definition of aggression adopted by the League of Nations and by the treaties signed in London in 1933 included the support of armed bands invading the territory of another State. United States Act 165 provided for just that type of aggression and consequently constituted a flagrant interference in the domestic affairs of the USSR and the peoples' democracies.

3. The Act spoke of purposes for which persons living in the USSR, Poland or other countries were to be financed. Such persons were certainly neither sick people nor children, for, if that were the case, the funds for which provision was made should have been used for building schools and hospitals. The purpose of the Act being to organize armed units in the service of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization there was no doubt as to the character of those " specially selected " persons. Moreover, it was indicated in the *New York Times* of 25 November 1951 that the purpose of the Act was to create secret armed groups for diversionist activities in the East European countries.

4. The United States had repeatedly undertaken, in international treaties, to respect the independence of other States. Mr. Mansfield, who, as a member of the United States Congress, was one of the authors of the Act, claimed that it did not constitute interference in the domestic affairs of other States, but that its sole purpose was to assist fugitives. Could he have forgotten that when it was under discussion by the United States Congress its purpose had been stated to be to assist and give orders to secret organizations, present or future, working against the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies ?

5. Moreover, the Mutual Security Act was only the logical conclusion of a series of acts passed by the United States Congress with the design of establishing United States world hegemony. First, there had been the Truman doctrine and the use of Greece and Turkey as bases for aggression ; then, the Marshall Plan, designed to make use, in the cold war, of the States receiving the aid poured out to them. The culmination of the United States' aggressive intentions was represented by the creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the re-establishment of the *Wehrmacht*. Briefly, the Mutual Security Act was only another illustration of the methods and purposes of NATO. In the beginning the North Atlantic Treaty had been described as a regional agreement, but the inclusion of Greece and Turkey had revealed its real nature, namely United States expansion. Nevertheless, that expansion stopped at the frontier of the free States, which formed an insurmountable barrier. That being so, the United States, out of hatred for the systems of the USSR and the peoples'

\* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

democracies, which were free of any economic dependence on the United States, was waging an underground war in order to force those States to submit by the use of terror and subversion.

6. How could the United States representative claim that the Mutual Security Act existed only on paper? Did he pretend that Congress had adopted it without intending to put it into effect? That argument obviously did not stand scrutiny, especially having regard to the fact that the United States' hostile activities against the USSR had begun long before the passage of Act 165. It was in 1948 that the existence of the famous "Plan X" had been discovered, which had been directed by Allen Dulles and designed to facilitate the organization of acts of sabotage in the USSR and the peoples' democracies. Although the United States representative had claimed that Allen Dulles was only engaged in civilian duties, it was learnt a few months later that he had been appointed chief of the United States counter-intelligence service. Similarly, the American Press had expressed indignation when the USSR had accused Mr. Bedell Smith, United States Ambassador to Moscow, of spying for his Government. Shortly afterwards, however, Mr. Bedell Smith had been appointed chief of the United States intelligence service.

7. Mr. Mansfield had invoked the peace-loving traditions of the people of the United States as evidence to disprove the aggressive nature of the Mutual Security Act. Obviously it was not the peaceable intentions of the people of the United States that were in question, but the policy of the United States Government.

8. It was also false to pretend that the Act was not yet in force, because in fact it was only the culmination of a movement which had begun immediately after the Second World War, when the new peoples' democracies had adopted a form of government which forever barred to their enslavement by the United States.

9. From 1945 onwards, when Poland was devoting all her efforts to reconstruction, the United States had been hiring one band of spies and saboteurs after another and supplying arms to former collaborators with the Gestapo, with the object of overthrowing the Polish Government. Mr. Bliss Lane, the first United States Ambassador to Warsaw, had recognized, in a book he had published, that the United States Embassy in Warsaw was a spy centre and that it had tried to impose a Polish Government which would have made allowance for United States interests. For that purpose it had financed and assisted gangs of terrorists composed of former Nazi collaborators and common criminals. Why was Mr. Mansfield indignant at the fact that United States diplomats in States behind the so-called "iron curtain" were regarded as spies? Almost all the spy trials in Poland had revealed that the accused had had close relations with the United States diplomatic services.

10. The United States Government was still organizing anti-Polish para-military groups in western Germany, called "security detachments" and recruited among former Nazi collaborators. The Polish Government, as far back as 1946, had protested against the continued existence of those groups, which, among other activities, obstructed the repatriation of Polish nationals.

11. Further activities of the United States against the Polish Government could be mentioned, for example, the incorporation of Polish displaced persons in the United States Army, the creation in West Germany of subversive centres, called "labour service companies", the organized transfer of saboteurs to Poland, with the help of the German General Guderian, one of the destroyers of Warsaw.

12. In the light of those facts, it was clear that United States Act 165 was designed solely to institute official financial aid for a campaign which had so far been financed by secret funds.

13. The revelations which had come to light during the trials in Hungary and Bulgaria and the arrests in Albania and Romania of saboteurs who had landed by parachute from American planes, also proved that the United States had not awaited the adoption of the Mutual Security Act to finance and co-ordinate subversion and sabotage in each of the peoples' democracies.

14. Even on its own territory the United States Government was organizing and co-ordinating the activities of a number of training centres for traitors and saboteurs, such as the "Green International", the International Federation of Free Journalists of central and eastern Europe, the Committee for a Free Europe and others whose work consisted of launching incitements to revolt and sabotage through the medium of the "Free Europe" radio station. In that connexion, mention should also be made of the release in West Germany of balloons containing incitements to subversive activity and treason addressed to the inhabitants of the peoples' democracies. Those calls to rebellion organized by the United States were, shortly, it seemed, to be multiplied by the use of floating broadcasting stations.

15. The appropriations voted by the United States Congress for the Mutual Security Act were apparently intended to give the peoples of eastern Europe a taste of the kind of freedom prevailing in the United States. But the inhabitants of the peoples' democracies would know how to resist the pressure of the United States and would reject the radical discrimination, lynching and Ku-Klux-Klan activities, together with everything else that was carried on under the aegis of the police, the FBI and the Committee on Un-American Activities.

16. The criminal nature of Act 165 was apparent from the cynicism with which the United States representative had declared at the 472nd meeting that the combatants for peace were foreign agents.

17. The Mutual Security Act constituted an interference in the domestic affairs of other States. As such, it was a violation of the principles of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations. Its purpose was to finance the criminal activities of traitors and spies and to promote the perpetration of acts of sabotage with a view to changing the governmental structure of other States in the interests of the United States. It was a preparation for aggression and war.

18. That charge had not been refuted by the United States representative. It was the duty of the First Committee to arrive at an honest decision whereby it would uphold the principles of the United Nations and condemn a criminal piece of legislation. The Committee should therefore adopt the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/685).

19. Mr. DE PIMENTEL BRANDAO (Brazil) recalled that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the inclusion of the present item in the agenda. It had done so because it felt that the question was not serious enough to justify consideration. For the same reason, it considered that the draft resolution presented by the USSR delegation (A/C.1/685) should be rejected.

20. He could not accept the contention that the Mutual Security Act constituted an aggressive measure and an interference in the domestic affairs of other States. The Soviet Union was of opinion that the text of the Act

concealed sinister designs whereas in fact it was capable of bearing a very moderate interpretation.

21. He admitted that the wording of the law was not very clear and might lend itself to misrepresentation and distortion. The Act, as he saw it, intended the use of appropriations for persons who had escaped from Soviet areas and for persons who might escape after the law was enacted, those persons being referred to, therefore, as "persons residing in" the said areas. The appropriation was to be used for the formation of such refugees into elements of the military forces supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or "for other purposes". The whole Mutual Security Act, being aimed at two points (first defence, second economic recovery), could easily be conceived as other forms of economic assistance, the incorporation into armed forces being also, for a refugee, a form of economic aid.

22. In any case, it was for the United States delegation to give the text its proper meaning, and he would merely like to indicate that several interpretations were possible.

23. The considerations advanced by the Soviet Union in support of its complaint were far from convincing because the complaint had been lodged by a State whose methods of interference in the domestic affairs of other States were known the world over. It should be recalled that the aim of the Soviet Union's foreign policy was to satisfy its imperialist ambitions and spread its economic and social ideas throughout the world. In almost all countries, the communist parties were instruments of that policy, being entirely subservient to the directives of the Cominform, which were those of the Soviet Union Government. The contention that there was a legal difference between the acts of the Soviet Union Government and those of the communist party was purely theoretical. In actual fact, all governments of non-communist countries were acquainted with examples of the sabotage, subversion and intrigue engaged in by elements acting on orders from Moscow.

24. The complaint against the United States was without any foundation. If, however, the United Nations had to conduct an investigation into that subject, it would be necessary for it to take similar action with regard to all cases of interference and aggression. To act otherwise would be equivalent to casting out the mote and disregarding the beam.

25. Mr. KISELYOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) considered that the Mutual Security Act of 1951 constituted an act of aggression against the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies as well as a serious threat to international peace and security. It was an unprecedented act of interference in the domestic affairs of other States and a violation of the generally accepted standards of international law and the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter. As Mr. Vyshinsky, the head of the Soviet delegation, had already pointed out, its adoption also constituted a flagrant breach by the United States of the agreement concluded on 16 November 1933 between the USSR and the United States.

26. The Act proved that United States foreign policy, far from being based on the principle of democratic collaboration between peoples in the interests of peace, was intended for aggressive purposes and was directed against peace-loving peoples. The whole world understood that United States ruling circles felt the need for a legal buttress for their attempts to disturb international relations and stimulate hostility towards the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies. The Mutual Security Act of 1951 furnished them with that support.

27. Nothing, however, could either justify or disguise the hostile and aggressive policy of the United States towards those countries. That policy was displayed in the most diverse forms. As everyone knew, the United States was attempting to disturb trade relations, and was conducting systematic campaigns of slander by means of broadcasts—particularly those of the Voice of America. It was conveying spies, saboteurs, subversive agents and hired killers into the peoples' democracies and was supporting the activities of traitors and emigrants who had fled to the United States and other western countries. The Government of the United States was doing all those things because it wanted to unleash a new world war for the achievement of its insensate plan of world domination. The Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the other peoples' democracies, pursuing a policy of international peace and collaboration with the support of all progressive elements of the human race, were categorically opposed to that aggressive scheme of American imperialism. They fought against the remilitarization of West Germany and Japan, and against the inclusion of the countries of the Near East in the military system of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and they asked the cessation of hostilities in Korea. The policy of the United States Government also included the establishment of innumerable military bases along the frontiers of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the other peoples' democracies, as well as constant violations of those countries' air space. The inclusion of Turkey and Greece in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was further proof of the aggressive policy of the United States. The United States Government was giving direct military assistance to the Government of Tito in Belgrade, thus enabling it to commit acts of provocation on the frontiers of Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Albania.

28. Whereas the peoples of the world were intensifying their efforts to defend the peace, the United States Government was endeavouring to foment international tension. To illustrate that contention he cited evidence adduced at various trials in Albania, Romania, Hungary and Bulgaria, and proving that a vast network of espionage, sabotage and terrorism had been organized in those countries under the auspices of the United States diplomatic missions and with the collaboration of hordes of war criminals, reactionary elements and fascists. It had also transpired at certain of those trials that the United States administration in West Germany was doing everything possible to convert the inmates of the refugee camps into spies and murderers in the pay of the United States.

29. In his statement at the 472nd meeting, the United States representative had endeavoured to mask the aggressive character of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 by alleging that it was designed to give United States assistance to persons who had fled the countries mentioned in the Act. That attempt had been exposed by the USSR representative who had quoted innumerable facts and statements by British and American persons in official positions. To those could be added the statement made early that month by United States Senator Taft who, addressing a Republican women's club in Massachusetts, had said that many emigrants from the USSR and the countries of eastern Europe would be very glad to return to those countries as secret agents and that the organization of a resistance movement might bring about the end of communist control of certain of those territories.

30. The Act in question clearly formed an integral part of the aggressive activities of the American imperialists who were gathering around them all the survivors of the defunct

fascist régimes, traitors, criminals and other dregs of society for use in the war of aggression they were preparing against the USSR and the peoples' democracies. That Act, for which there was no precedent, revealed the duplicity and hypocrisy of those American pacifists who, from the rostrum of the United Nations, made speeches glorifying peace and peaceful collaboration, while pursuing in practice a policy of provocation, subversion and aggression.

31. For all those reasons, the Byelorussian delegation whole-heartedly supported the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/685).

32. Mr. MANSFIELD (United States of America) said that the charge of aggression combined with interference in the domestic affairs of another country was the most serious charge that one Member of the United Nations could make against another. Such a charge should under no circumstances be made for propaganda purposes and the Government which made it must be able to produce convincing proof. The Soviet Union had made such a charge against the United States but had produced no proof whatever. The only conclusion to be drawn was that it had another purpose in mind. That purpose was to attempt once again to malign the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and to impede the defence efforts of the free world, in the given instance, through the United States Mutual Security Act of 1951. As he had explained at the 472nd meeting, the broad objectives of the Mutual Security Act were to strengthen the individual and collective defences of free countries and to facilitate their effective participation in the United Nations system of collective security.

33. The USSR representative had attacked only title I of the Act, which dealt with the defence of the North Atlantic community, whereas title II dealt with the Near East and Africa, title III with Asia and the Pacific, and title IV with the American Republics.

34. So far as the North Atlantic Treaty was concerned, it constituted not a challenge but the inevitable response of the North Atlantic community to the Soviet Union's unmistakable attempts to extend its power over the continent of Europe by force or threats.

35. Following the practice of totalitarian politicians, the USSR was inverting the meaning of words, whereby war became "peace" and tyranny became "democracy". Thus, it was constantly charging the North Atlantic Treaty Organization with harbouring aggressive aims, and it was now endeavouring to distort the Mutual Security Act by alleging that it was aggressive and threatening towards the USSR, whereas its purpose was solely defensive.

36. The USSR representative had spoken at length on a permissive amendment to the Mutual Security Act providing funds for refugees from certain eastern European countries who wished to join the NATO defence effort. He had painted a picture of foreign legions ready to attack the USSR and the countries within its orbit, and to join other subversive forces already organized by the United States. That constituted merely a unilateral interpretation of the terms of the Act. The intention of the United States Congress was entirely different: it was that the funds appropriated under the amendment should be used, at the

discretion of the President of the United States, to allow refugees who had escaped from eastern Europe or persons who might succeed in escaping in the future, to take part in the defence of the North Atlantic community if they chose to do so.

37. A further consideration was how the Act would actually be administered. The United States delegation wished to state emphatically that it would never be administered by the United States authorities for the fantastic purposes described by the USSR delegation. Whether military formations within NATO would actually be created was a matter to be decided by the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, who would determine it after consultation. If such formations were ever established, they would be used only to repel aggression.

38. Those unfortunate people who sought freedom from political oppression were not traitors to their own fatherlands. They should enjoy not only the right of asylum, but also the right to join in the defence of free Europe if they chose to do so. Many people in similar circumstances during the Second World War had fought in the Red Army, just as others who had escaped from the countries occupied by the nazis had fought with the allies in the west. The United States delegation would agree with the USSR delegation, on the other hand, that to train and equip a "foreign legion" for the invasion of another State and the overthrow of its government would be an aggressive act.

39. Although the Soviet Union delegation had accused the United States of aggression and interference in the domestic affairs of other countries, it had been unable to indicate where or in what from that had occurred. Nothing really had happened beyond the fact that the Soviet Union delegation had presented a unilateral interpretation of an amendment to a legislative act of the United States. The USSR representative had merely given an illustration of the deep and unwarranted suspicion which the Soviet Union harboured for the outside world.

40. As regards the USSR representative's reference to the United States C-47 transport plane whose crew were at present in Hungary, he wished to emphasize that the equipment of the plane had been the standard equipment for the military transport service of the United States Air Force. Its crew, however, were still illegally detained, and United States diplomatic representatives had been denied all access to them.

41. In conclusion, he said that he did not intend to intervene again in the debate unless he was forced to reply to further statements by the USSR representative.

42. The CHAIRMAN stated that there were still twelve names on the list of speakers.

43. After a short exchange of views, THE CHAIRMAN proposed that statements should be limited to a half hour each, except for that of the USSR representative, since it was on his proposal that the item under consideration had been included on the agenda.

*It was thus decided.*

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.