



Friday, 21 December 1951, at 10.30 a.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

	Page
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>).....	111

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. Mrs. SEKANINOVA-CAKARTOVA (Czechoslovakia) said the Mutual Security Act adopted in October 1951 by the United States Government was significant of United States policy, which had always been hostile to the people's democracies. The United States could never forgive those countries for vesting power in the people and opposing the reign of the capitalists. That was the real reason for the Act, which organized sabotage and legalized shameless interference in the domestic affairs of other States. The United States Department of State, which merely affirmed that the charges of the Soviet Union were pure slander, really regretted that Congress had not made the appropriation secretly rather than publicly, but the *New York Times* itself ridiculed such pusillanimity.

2. Contrary to the assertions of the United States representative the Act was not a harmless measure to provide assistance for refugees, but an instrument setting up a fifth column inside the countries concerned and a foreign legion outside them. It should be observed that the United States representative had not mentioned the second category of persons referred to by the Act, residents of the countries concerned who, according to the Act, were to be organized in military units or used for other purposes. None of those mysterious purposes had been mentioned by the Senate committee or by the representative of the United States.

3. Mr. Kersten from Wisconsin, the author of an amendment to the Act in question, had said that military aid to the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was not enough, and he had given a six-point summary of his "mutual security" programme :

(1) To withdraw recognition from the "communist régime in Moscow" and to secure its expulsion from the United Nations.

(2) To take similar action in respect of the people's democracies—the Soviet Union and the "satellite" governments.

(3) To give "escapees" from those countries the right of asylum.

(4) To create military units composed of "escapees" who would thus form part of the European army.

(5) To influence the populations concerned by propaganda, particularly by promising them "liberation" from their countries.

(6) Where appropriate, to give those peoples such direct assistance as might be necessary to achieve that "liberation".

4. The fourth point in particular showed clearly enough that it was not assistance for refugees that was involved, but the creation of an army of cheap mercenaries.

5. The assistance to be given to the residents of the countries concerned was a matter in which the United States Government was especially interested, and Mr. Kersten had more particularly in mind assistance to secret associations and subversive elements. The same Congressman had affirmed that in order to weaken the Soviet Union it was necessary to undermine it from within.

6. The amendment, proposed by Mr. Kersten and incorporated in the Act, to which the United States representative had not referred, clearly illustrated the determination to interfere which the Mutual Security Act expressed.

7. The Czechoslovak people, which had disappointed the United States by taking the road to socialism in 1945, had often had to suffer the effects of the hostile attitude which the United States had adopted. The Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 directed against the USSR and the

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

people's democracies, the attitude of the United States to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the impediments placed in the way of the operation in Germany of the airlines serving Czechoslovakia—all those were measures which in no way corresponded with the soothing statements of Mr. Mansfield. In fact, as had been said by one of the United States congressmen, the intention of the Act was that the United States should have spies and feelers in all the countries referred to.

8. It was a curious mark of friendship to send to Czechoslovakia balloons carrying propaganda pamphlets. Sometimes American diplomats themselves equipped and directed espionage groups inside a country. The same tactics were adopted in West Germany, where deserters from Czechoslovakia were formed into military units and took courses in schools for espionage, sabotage and terrorism. The Bonn Government issued a law to facilitate the passage of agitators over the Czechoslovak frontier. All those measures resulted in murders and acts of terrorism in Czechoslovakia under the direction of the Americans themselves. The delegate of Czechoslovakia then cited a list of concrete cases of United States interference, direct or indirect, in the domestic affairs of Czechoslovakia, of violations of Czechoslovak air space and territorial integrity, of acts of sabotage and terrorism, of spying and murders committed by United States agents on Czechoslovak soil. The hostile activities were carried out even by diplomatic and other United States officials whose names Mrs. Sekaninova-Cakrtova cited.

9. The Act of 1951, which legalized activities that were shameful and without precedent in international relations, was therefore a cynical violation of the principles both of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law.

10. The Czechoslovak delegation therefore firmly supported the USSR complaint.

11. Mr. MACDONNELL (Canada) said that Canada, situated geographically between the United States of America and the USSR, was particularly interested in the discussion. His constant relations with the United States enabled him to affirm that the American people were tolerant, friendly and profoundly peace-loving. When a State organized for war, its neighbours felt the effects. It should be mentioned that his country's relations with the United States were certainly happier than those of the countries bordering on the USSR with their too powerful ally.

12. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was in no way aggressive. The policy which it represented had been adopted for want of a better one in order to protect a security that had been shaken by the aggressive and subversive attitude of one great Power, which had impaired the United Nations collective security system by its abuse of the right of veto.

13. Contrary to what Mr. Vyshinsky had said, the Mutual Security Act was not an act of aggression, and Canada would therefore oppose the USSR draft resolution.

14. As for the refugees to whom Mr. Vyshinsky referred in a general way as traitors and vagrants, Canada, whose population was composed of relatively recent immigrants, was well acquainted with the mentality of such people. To prevent a man from leaving his country was a totalitarian principle which Canadian public opinion could not admit. Those who refused to live under communist directives should not be regarded as traitors.

15. In Anglo-Saxon law there was a principle that persons who appealed to the court should come with clean hands.

It was strange to see a government like that of the USSR bringing such charges against the United States. Recently, Mr. Vyshinsky had affirmed that the Soviet Union Government was quite distinct from the Communist Party. Canada had experienced Soviet espionage in 1946. The official documents then seized had proved that no such distinction existed. There was no valid reason to think that any important changes had since intervened.

16. The Canadian delegation would therefore oppose the USSR draft resolution.

17. Mr. BARANOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the USSR representative's statements had proved beyond all doubt that the adoption of the amendment to the Mutual Security Act by the United States Congress constituted flagrant intervention in the domestic affairs of other States in contravention of the principles of international public law and of the United Nations Charter. The amendment to United States Act 165 was a breach of the 1933 agreement between the United States and the USSR and a violation of the provisions of the treaties of peace, which the United States had signed in 1947 with Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria, as well as of the Moscow declaration of 1943 and the London quadripartite agreements, signed in 1945. The amendment introduced the policy of the United States, which was aimed at poisoning international relations, into the sphere of legislation and opened the way to the danger of force and arbitrary action.

18. The United States representative had sought to prove that the purpose of the amendment was to maintain security and promote general welfare by assisting friendly nations. He had similarly claimed that the intentions of the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization were purely defensive. The statements of United States leaders, the organization of military alliances and the development of a network of American military bases abroad had sufficed to convince the whole world of the aggressive character of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, of United States foreign policy and of the amendment to Act 165 in particular.

19. To refute the United States representative's assertions regarding the allegedly pacific foreign policy of the United States, it was only necessary to quote one of his fellow Congressmen, Mr. Busbey, who, on returning from a visit to western Europe, had admitted that, as a result of the present policy of the United States Government, that country had become the most hated nation in the world.

20. The aggressive nature of the amendment to Act 165 had even been emphasized in the United States Press. The *Daily Compass* had, for example, pointed out that that terrorist fund had been established for the purpose of maintaining spies, terrorists and other criminals.

21. The amendment to Act 165 might usefully be compared with a book recently published by an American Mr. James Burnham, entitled *The Coming Defeat of Communism*, in which the author asserted, *inter alia*, that in order to defeat the USSR, the United States must oppose any possibility of peaceful negotiations, which could benefit only the Soviet Union.

22. In referring to the amendment, Senator Taft had called for the despatch of secret agents to States regarded as communist in order to organize an anti-communist movement. Refugees who had betrayed their country had been recruited for that purpose in West Germany under the aegis of the United States. A conference of such traitors had recently been organized behind the screen of United States occupation. Among them were Ukrainians, who had collaborated with the Nazis during the war and whom the

Americans were now keeping in camps with a view to their incorporation in the NATO forces. The amendment to the Mutual Security Act merely provided legal sanction for the persistently aggressive attitude of the United States.

23. Mr. Mansfield had denied that the American military aircraft which violated the air space of the USSR and the people's democracies had been despatched on criminal missions. He had asserted that the equipment found on board the aircraft, which had been compelled to land in Hungary, had been the standard equipment of United States military aircraft. So far from that being the case, the plane had been found to contain detailed military maps of Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Romania, the Ukraine and the Volga region.

24. There was nothing surprising in such aggressive manifestations of United States policy. In 1918 President Wilson had officially proposed the separation of the Ukraine from Russia and its conversion into a protectorate under western control. There had also been the armed interventions of the western Powers in 1919, which had led to the separation of the western Ukraine from Soviet Ukraine by force. United States hostility towards the Ukraine had shown itself again in 1945 when war criminals and Ukrainian collaborators with the Nazis had found refuge with the American authorities in West Germany. Hundreds of Ukrainians were at present detained by the Americans and prevented from returning to their homes. In the United States itself, committees of Ukrainians were carrying out a hostile campaign against the USSR and the Ukraine through the medium of the *Voice of America*.

25. It was difficult to understand the attitude of the Brazilian representative at the 473rd meeting, who recognized that the meaning of Act 165 was not clear but nevertheless proposed to close his eyes to its aggressive character.

26. The amendment to the Mutual Security Act constituted interference in the domestic affairs of other States in violation of international law and the principles of the United Nations Charter. The Ukrainian delegation therefore supported the USSR draft resolution and appealed to the Committee to condemn that amendment and to recommend its repeal by the United States.

27. Mr. ESQUIVEL (Costa Rica) recalled that since its accession to power in 1917 the USSR Government had clearly shown that it intended to overthrow the foreign governments with which it wished to maintain diplomatic relations. It was therefore difficult to believe that the USSR was not still pursuing that same subversive policy.

28. How could Mr. Vyshinsky describe as traitors and criminals the hundreds of thousands of Hungarian, Romanian, Polish, Czech and other patriots who wanted to escape tyranny and flee from a political régime imposed by a foreign power? Clearly the help given to those peoples who thirsted for freedom was of a purely defensive character.

29. When, in 1948, the communist movement had been outlawed in Costa Rica, a document had been discovered showing that in case of war the Costa Rican communists would fight with the USSR. There was not a doubt that they were traitors to their country. As for Mr. Vyshinsky, he probably considered that the Costa Rican patriots were traitors to the USSR. In the circumstances the defence of freedom must be collective. That was why the Costa Rican Government supported all regional treaties designed to ensure the collective defence of the parties thereto.

30. If the activities referred to in the amendment to United States Act 165 were defined as constituting aggression and intervention in the domestic affairs of other States, a

general review of alleged aggressive activities would be called for and it would be necessary precisely to define the responsibilities of States which interfered in the domestic affairs of the countries in eastern Europe, supported the aggressors in Korea and interfered in the internal affairs of Latin-American States.

31. The Costa Rican delegation would oppose the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/685) since the USSR had not given convincing proof in support of its complaint and since the United States did not intend to overthrow established governments by force.

32. Mr. LACOSTE (France) pointed out that Mr. Mansfield had explained to the Committee the purpose, scope and significance of the amendment to the United States Mutual Security Act. The amendment must be interpreted in the light of the aims of the Act itself, which was designed to maintain security and general welfare in the United States through assistance to friendly nations in the interests of peace and international security. It was perfectly natural that, to offset the expenditure of \$7,000 million involved in the financing of the Act, mention should, in the first place, be made of internal security and well-being. But the important feature of the Act was that it sought to help friendly nations for the sake of peace and the maintenance of international security. The amendment was designed to help political refugees and enable them, if they volunteered, to participate in the activities of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Since the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty had joined together to maintain peace and international security in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, it followed therefore that the aim of the amendment to Act 165 was also in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and that the complaint of the USSR was unfounded. Not only had the United States not committed aggression, but it had no intention of committing it.

33. Furthermore, it followed from the discussion that from the point of view of the USSR, its main purpose was to launch a new propaganda campaign. The French delegation did not wish to reply to every malicious hint directed against France: it would, however, state that France held fast by the formally established principle of sending no person back to his country of origin against his will, criminals of war excepted.

34. Since they were well-known to everyone, the French delegation would not mention the multifarious subversive activities indulged in for so long by the complaining party. But it wished to indicate that in the circumstances the USSR complaint took on the form of a paradox. Since it was unfounded, the French delegation would vote against the USSR draft resolution.

35. Mr. WILSON (New Zealand) recalled that the USSR had recently been accused, in another Committee of the General Assembly, of having interfered in the domestic affairs of Yugoslavia and had been unable to refute the accusation. Now the USSR had taken the lead in lodging a complaint against the United States, but as sole proof of its contention had confined itself to citing the amendment to Act 165.

36. The main purpose of that amendment was to give financial assistance to political refugees within the framework of NATO. This was an unusual response to an unusual situation, brought about by communist pressure throughout the world.

37. The USSR representative might deny the existence of aggressive communism. It sufficed to reply that there

was an element of intimidation in the communist parties of the whole world with which the USSR was hand in glove. In the eyes of the leaders of the USSR, the guilt of the United States was their strength and their desire to resist communist intimidation.

38. The New Zealand delegation believed that the aims of United States policy were not aggressive. The moderation which the United States had shown in the direction of

operations in Korea confirmed that view. The USSR representative's vehemence in regard to NATO and United States Act 165 showed that the USSR was less concerned with the assistance granted to refugees by the United States than with the fact that the refugees should exist and thus expose the contradictions which arose between the claims of a totalitarian society and of man's inborn freedom.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.