



**CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda item 66:	
Declaration concerning the peaceful coexistence of States ( <u>concluded</u> ) . . . . .	445
Completion of the Committee's work. . . . .	449

**Chairman: Mr. Djalal ABDOH (Iran).**

**AGENDA ITEM 66**

**Declaration concerning the peaceful coexistence of States (A/3673, A/C.1/L.198) (concluded)**

1. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that most of the speakers in the debate had stated their approval of the principles of peaceful coexistence and co-operation between States, irrespective of their social structure. That was not surprising, since coexistence was one of the main requirements of the modern world. Nevertheless, some representatives, having paid lip-service to the principle, had shown that the ruling circles in their countries did not wish the matter to be considered by the General Assembly and had tried to prevent its proper discussion. In view of certain incorrect statements, which had distorted the whole problem, he felt obliged to make some additional remarks on peaceful coexistence.

2. The statement made by the United States representative at the 936th meeting was a typical example of "cold war" propaganda, and seemed to show that the last thing the ruling circles of the United States wanted was peace; they were afraid of abandoning the policy of the "cold war", of militaristic propaganda and of the armaments race. If the United States representative himself believed the false statements he had made about the Communist countries, he had fallen a victim to his own country's propaganda, which was poisoning the minds of many Americans. An objective appraisal of the facts would clearly show who was in favour of peace and who in favour of war, and the United States representative would not succeed in misrepresenting the peaceful nature of the policy of the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies.

3. The United States representative had alleged that the question of peaceful coexistence had been raised in order to undermine the forthcoming session of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in Paris. It was true that Members of the United Nations did not wish conferences to take place at which war, and not peace, was planned, but it was as the result of United States action that the question was being discussed at the end of the session, on the eve of the NATO meetings, and not at the beginning of the session, as its importance would have warranted. The Soviet Union was proud that the question was being considered in the United Nations at the initiative of its delegation.

4. The United States representative had tried to shift the blame for the armaments race and the "cold war" to the Soviet Union and to prove that the existing international tension was due to the policy of the USSR. Such allegations were patently absurd, and were reminiscent of the arguments used by the proponents of fascism before the Second World War. The real reasons for international tension and for the threat of a new world war lay in the efforts of imperialist circles in certain countries to impose their will upon other nations and in their recourse to the use or threat of force when the internal régime or foreign policy of other countries did not suit them. Under the cover of so-called anti-communism, those circles were conducting an aggressive policy aimed at world domination, the abolition of democratic freedoms and the re-enslavement of peoples who had acquired their freedom. Their international relations were based on the principle of the domination of the strong over the weak and on the establishment of military bases abroad and of military blocs of countries dependent on them. Forty years previously, the world had been dominated by a handful of capitalist imperialists, who had ruled by jungle law; today the imperialist Powers, particularly the United States, wished to follow the same policy and to keep the world in a state of suspicion and fear.

5. To that end, they were creating obstacles to the preparation of an agreement for the reduction of armed forces and the abolition of atomic weapons. The Western Powers bore the main responsibility for the failure of the disarmament talks, through their rejection of the constructive proposals made by the Soviet Union. Instead of developing relations of friendship and peaceful co-operation, those countries tried to create conflicts wherever possible and to hamper the peaceful settlement of disputes. The United States, moreover, had raised interference in the domestic affairs of other countries to the level of a State policy.

6. For example, the People's Republic of China, which had cast off the imperialist yoke and desired only to live in peace and to increase the well-being of its citizens, had never shown any intention of attacking the United States, annexing any of its territories or setting up bases near the United States. The latter country, however, had assumed control over Taiwan and other Chinese islands and was protecting the subversive activities of the Kuomintang with its fleet and armed forces. The United States was also preventing the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations and hampering the peaceful settlement of the questions of Korea and Viet-Nam. It was not the People's Republic of China but the United States that was causing trouble in the area. The United States had not concluded a single agreement with any country on peaceful coexistence, whereas the People's Republic of China had recognized the principles of coexistence and was applying them in its relations with India, Burma and other countries. Finally, Tibet, to which the United

States representative had referred, was Chinese and not American territory and had been peacefully united with the People's Republic of China; it had no more been annexed than the State of Arkansas had been annexed by the United States.

7. In the course of the debate, the United States representative and other speakers had referred to the counter-revolutionary activities in Hungary in 1956. In that connexion, it should be borne in mind that since the Second World War, the United States and other Western Powers had been consistently conducting a campaign of subversion against the USSR and the peoples' democracies. Those activities, both open and secret, were conducted by official organs of the United States, at enormous expense and in pursuance of the "liberation" policy proclaimed by the United States Government. For years, United States intelligence organs had been sending spies into the peoples' democracies to foment counter-revolutionary and reactionary activities and had been forming special armed detachments of reactionary *émigrés* in the West. The Hungarian rebellion in 1956 was a typical example of an overt attempt to undermine the solidarity of the socialist countries by armed force, to wrest Hungary from their ranks and turn it into a hotbed of unrest in Eastern Europe. The rebellion had also been an attempt to distract attention from the aggression in the Middle East and elsewhere. The Hungarian people, however, had dealt resolutely with the counter-revolution and there could be no doubt that any similar attempts would be met by the combined and vigorous action of all the socialist countries.

8. In order to conceal their own role in the Hungarian *putsch*, the United States and other Western Powers had initiated a campaign of falsehood and slander against the USSR and Hungary. However, none of those fabrications could blind the world public to the real relations between the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies in Europe and Asia, which were characterized by identity of purpose and true fraternal cooperation.

9. The aggressive policy of the Western Powers was not directed against the socialist countries alone, but also against other peaceful and independent countries. Those Powers were alarmed at the fact that over 700 million people in Asia and Africa had thrown off the colonial yoke and had established sovereign States, which were strongly in favour of the maintenance of peace and the relaxing of international tension. The imperialists and monopolists were making every effort to maintain the colonial system. It was not the USSR but the United States that had proclaimed the Eisenhower doctrine of economic, political and military interference in the domestic affairs of the countries of the Middle East, had set up bases in those countries and was making colossal profits from the exploitation of their natural resources. It was not the USSR but the United Kingdom, France and Israel that had attacked Egypt, with the support of the United States. It was not the USSR but Turkey, a member of the NATO bloc, that had recently concentrated its forces on the Syrian frontier. It was not the USSR but France that was shedding blood in Algeria; not the USSR but the United Kingdom that was bombing the peaceful populations of Oman and Yemen.

10. The United States representative had also falsified the facts concerning the period before the Second World War. Many would undoubtedly remember that Hitler's

régime had been based on gold from American banks and that imperialist circles in the United States and other Western countries sought to incite Hitler to attack the Soviet Union, after whetting his appetite with one European country after another. Their plan, as described by President Truman, consisted in setting Germany and the USSR against each other until they had bled each other white. The Soviet Union had tried to set up a system of collective security, but that attempt had been thwarted by the imperialists, who placed class interests above national interests, and had thus plunged the world into war.

11. It was a fact that the United States was now reviving German militarism in order to use it against the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies. Nazi war criminals, such as General Speidel, were being placed in command of NATO forces; recent reports from Denmark and Norway showed, however, that that policy was not popular among the peoples of Europe.

12. The dangerous policy of strength and of increasing world tension was unrealistic and could not lead to the solution of outstanding international problems; it was advantageous only to the monopolies, which derived enormous profits from the armaments race. In the vital interests of mankind, imperialist principles must be abolished in international relations and war must be excluded as a method of settling international questions. The "cold war" must be brought to an end and peaceful co-operation must be established.

13. The Soviet Union considered that that could be achieved through the recognition by all countries of the principle of peaceful coexistence. All that the United States representative had proved by quoting Lenin out of context, in his disquisition on the relative merits of socialism and capitalism, was that in 1920 the Soviet State had been obliged to defend itself from the attacks of the capitalist countries which had vainly endeavoured to restore the régime of despotism and exploitation that the Russian people had overthrown in 1917.

14. In 1917 the Soviet Government had appealed to the participants in the First World War to conclude a democratic peace, but the Governments of the capitalist countries had not wanted peaceful coexistence with the young Soviet Republic and had done everything within their power to overthrow it by direct military intervention and assistance to the Czarist generals. Their activities had converted an almost bloodless revolution into a destructive five-year war. The people of Russia, however, had brought their plans to naught, a task made easier by the fact that the interventionists had fallen out among themselves. In the speech to which the United States representative had referred, Lenin had foretold that the day would come when the Soviet Union would be sufficiently strong to repel any imperialist aggressor. That was now the case, but it did not mean that the Soviet Union intended to attack anyone.

15. The United States representative would gain nothing by quoting out of context and distorting statements by Lenin and Khrushchev. The United States representative had tried to prove, by quoting some words by Khrushchev, that as far as the USSR was concerned, peaceful coexistence was nothing but a phase in the Communist struggle for world conquest. In quoting from Mr. Khrushchev's interview with *The New York Times* correspondent James Reston, the United States representative had carefully edited the quotation so as to conceal the fact that Mr. Khrushchev

had spoken of the victory of socialism in "peaceful" competition, and primarily economic competition, with capitalism and as a result of the inevitable process of historical evolution. Mr. Khrushchev had made it clear that the Communists did not need war to win.

16. The whole world knew that for the USSR peaceful coexistence was not merely a phase but a basic principle of its foreign policy which had been stated by Lenin in the earliest days of the Soviet State. The classics of Marxism-Leninism, the documents of the Communist Party, the policy followed by the socialist countries and their achievements in a few short years all showed that the socialist system was peace-loving and the most creative of all social systems known to history.

17. The Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the USSR had endorsed a line of conduct based on Lenin's principle of peaceful coexistence with all countries regardless of their social structure and had stressed the importance for good international relations of the following five principles: mutual respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of others, non-aggression, non-intervention in the internal affairs of others, development of inter-State relations on the basis of equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence and economic co-operation. It had stated categorically that the Communist Party was opposed to war and had urged the Soviet State to struggle for international peace and security, the establishment of mutual trust between States and the relaxation of international tension. That policy reflected the aspirations of the Soviet people and was consistently pursued by the Soviet Government in international affairs.

18. If ruling circles in the West, and particularly in the United States, were convinced of the superiority of capitalism, that was their affair, but it was not their business to determine whether or not other countries should have a socialist structure. Peaceful co-operation would be facilitated if each country were allowed to decide that question for itself.

19. The Soviet people resolutely believed in peace and peaceful coexistence because they had faith in their structure and their power and they were convinced that socialism would prove its superiority in peaceful competition with capitalism. If ruling circles in the capitalist countries believed in capitalism and did not fear such competition, they should be prepared to put the matter to the test and let the best man win. That would be in the interests of all people throughout the world.

20. The Soviet Union had demonstrated by its actions over the past forty years that it stood for peace and friendship among peoples. The export of revolution was a slanderous myth invented by the Western countries as part of their militaristic propaganda. It was understandable that the Western countries should have to resort to such methods, because socialism contained none of the irreconcilable contradictions from which the imperialist countries sought to escape by means of war. The socialist countries with their planned economies did not need to resort to expansion or war to secure markets or sources of raw materials. They had no groups interested in the armaments race and preparations for a new war. The socialist system had eliminated all social and national domination of the

strong over the weak and also the chauvinistic and racist ideologies which capitalistic circles used to dominate other peoples by force.

21. The peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet State was the main obstacle to the unleashing of a new war. Whenever the peaceful coexistence of the socialist countries with other, capitalist States had been upset, that had occurred as the result of armed attack on the USSR by imperialistic States. The USSR had spent over half the forty years of its existence repelling attacks by the Western Powers and eliminating the after-effects of those attacks.

22. To assert that the striving of the socialist States towards communism was incompatible with peaceful coexistence was an artificial argument designed by the opponents of peaceful coexistence to deceive world public opinion. He was convinced that the world would not be deceived. Nor would it be deceived by the attempts to prove that the USSR rather than the United States, the United Kingdom and France was responsible for the prevailing international tension. It was the NATO countries, planning a new war, rather than the USSR, that should be required to furnish proof of their peaceful intentions. It was Mr. Dulles with his "brink of war" policy who had already brought the world as a whole within sight of war on four occasions. Were it not for the attempts of the United States monopolists to achieve world domination there would be no divided Germany, Korea or Indo-China and no North Atlantic Treaty Organization, South-East Asia Treaty Organization and other aggressive groups. The policy of "negotiation from strength" was a United States and not a Soviet Union policy.

23. The United States representative had shown complete ignorance and a desire to twist the facts in his references to socialism and capitalism. He had attempted to reverse the meaning of the word "socialism" and its interpretation, but socialism was not a linguistic fiction: it had been successfully achieved in the Soviet Union and now extended to countries whose total population embraced more than one-third of mankind. In the countries which had adopted the socialist system there was no longer any exploitation of man by man, and democracy existed in its highest form, namely democracy for the workers and the whole people. Socialism meant the rapid growth of a country's productive forces and development of its national wealth with one end in view—the maximum satisfaction of the people's needs; it meant the flowering of culture and science, friendship between peoples, and the participation of the masses in the administration of the State. Socialism signified peace, for the socialist society was inherently incapable of following any policy other than a policy of peaceful coexistence based on equal rights, mutual respect and non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other countries.

24. Indeed, socialism was so attractive that attempts were even being made to give United States capitalism a façade of socialism by the use of such terms as "people's capitalism". The two concepts were clearly incompatible and would convince nobody. The peoples did not believe that capitalism had changed; they judged the situation on the basis of their own bitter experience of the misery, suffering and humiliation that it had brought them. The phrase "modern capitalism" was obviously absurd in view of the growing concentration of power in the hands of United States monopolies, the

ruin of small enterprises, the decline in the real wages of the people, the chronic unemployment and the sense of insecurity prevailing in the United States. It would be interesting to hear from the United States representative how many workers' representatives there were in the United States Congress. To the best of Mr. Kuznetsov's knowledge, there was not a single one. The vaunted American way of life was depriving millions of people in the United States of the enjoyment of elementary human rights solely on the ground that their skin was not white. American democracy meant that the country was governed by a small group of financial and industrial moguls who were driving the United States along the road to aggression and preparation for a new war.

25. The true nature of modern capitalism was even better known to the colonial and dependent peoples. Millions of people were still condemned to live in poverty while the tremendous natural resources of their countries and their labour were exploited to provide ever greater profits to United States monopolies. In short, the difference between socialism and capitalism was obvious and it did not weigh in favour of the latter.

26. The opponents of peaceful coexistence attempted to detract from the significance of the principles underlying it, but despite all their efforts those principles had already gained wide international recognition and governed the international relations between countries encompassing more than half the population of the world and countries both socialist and non-socialist in structure. The partisans of peaceful coexistence included many millions of people even in those States whose ruling circles were opposed to that idea. It was the duty of the United Nations to promote the further dissemination of the principles of peaceful coexistence and their implementation in practice. Only then would international peace and security be assured.

27. Mr. GARIN (Portugal) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.198), which was consistent with his country's traditional policy. The need to consolidate the uneasy peace of the world was more urgent even than the problems created by new developments in military technology. However, peaceful relations among States required more than mere words; they required the abandonment of hostile propaganda, non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States, respect for international treaties, reciprocity in the granting of concessions and facilities, and guarantees of the rights of all. The events of the past few years indicated clearly that the greatest contribution to that end must come from those who by their actions had weakened mutual confidence. Without the necessary good faith on all sides, even sincere measures to relax tension might contain in themselves the seed of destruction for some. It was in the light of those considerations that his delegation would cast its vote.

28. Mr. Krishna MENON (India) said it was encouraging to note that in spite of the grave differences of opinion among Committee members not a single representative had spoken against the substance of the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.198). It was his delegation's opinion that the differences to which the item had given rise in the Committee called for exactly the kind of tolerance and mutual respect for which the draft resolution appealed.

29. He wished to make it clear that the considerations set forth in the draft resolution were intended to apply to all States, regardless of their size, strength, economic development or political systems. He wished also to emphasize that it would be wrong to approach the draft resolution with the attitude that it was a harmless and unimportant statement of principle. Its adoption by the United Nations would kindle further hopes and the desire for further efforts to advance the cause of peace. Moreover, the draft resolution was an expression of the feelings of many newly-liberated States regarding the necessity for coexistence—feelings which had recently led to practical achievements in Laos, to take one example.

30. The draft resolution did not represent a compromise between two points of view; it was the formulation of a position which was in conformity with both the Charter of the United Nations and the five principles of coexistence, as well as with the imperative needs of the time. His delegation therefore appealed to the Soviet representative, in view of his known adherence to the fundamental ideas expressed in the draft resolution, to allow the Chairman to give it priority.

31. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had no objection to the proposal that the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.198) should be voted upon first. It considered that the Soviet draft resolution (A/3673) expressed the principles of peaceful coexistence in more definite and logical form; nevertheless, the three-Power draft resolution did on the whole express those ideas, and contained nothing that was not acceptable to his delegation. It therefore had no reason to object to that text and would vote in its favour.

32. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the draft resolution submitted by India, Sweden and Yugoslavia (A/C.1/L.198).

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Finland, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Malaya (Federation of), Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia.

Abstaining: China.

The draft resolution was adopted by 75 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

33. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in view of the results of the vote on the three-Power draft resolution his delegation would not press for a vote on its draft resolution.



34. Mr. Krishna MENON (India) thanked the Soviet representative for allowing the three-Power draft resolution to be voted upon first and for not pressing its draft resolution to a vote.

35. Mr. MALOLES (Philippines) said that in voting for the joint draft resolution his delegation had voted for a declaration on peaceful coexistence in the true, democratic sense of those words.

36. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the understanding that its provisions in no way derogated from the provisions of the United Nations Charter or of the declaration on the international conduct of States issued by the Bandung Conference.

#### Completion of the Committee's work

37. The CHAIRMAN, on behalf of the Committee, thanked the Secretary-General the Vice-Chairman, the Rapporteur, the Secretary of the Committee, the Deputy Secretary of the Committee and all the members of the Secretariat whose work had facilitated the Committee's task. He thanked the members of the Committee for their co-operation and good will and expressed his satisfaction that the Committee had been able to conclude its work with the unanimous adoption of a draft resolution which was an expression of the fervent desire of all the peoples of the world to see international peace and security firmly established.

38. Mr. MALOLES (Philippines), Mr. THORS (Iceland), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden, Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands, Mr. DRAGO (Argentina), on behalf of the Latin American delegations, Mr. LOUTFI (Egypt), on behalf of the Arab delegations, Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran), on behalf of his own delegation and that of Afghanistan, Mr. ISMAIL (Federation of Malaya), on behalf of the Commonwealth delegations, Prince WAN

WAITHAYAKON (Thailand), Mr. LODGE (United States of America), Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland), Mr. COOPER (Liberia), Mr. TSIANG (China), Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. GEORGES-PICOT (France), on behalf of his own delegation and those of Austria, Spain, Ireland, Italy and Portugal, Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. KIDRON (Israel), Mr. NINCIC (Yugoslavia), on behalf of his delegation and that of Greece, Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia), on behalf of his delegation and those of Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, and Mr. Krishna MENON (India) congratulated the Chairman on the way in which he had presided over the Committee's work and expressed their sympathy with his country's sufferings as a result of the recent earthquakes there. They also paid a tribute to the Vice-Chairman, the Rapporteur, the Secretary of the Committee and all the members of the Secretariat who had helped in the Committee's work.

39. Mr. DE BARROS (Brazil), Vice-Chairman, and Mr. MATSCH (Austria), Rapporteur, expressed their thanks for the kind words which had been said about the work they had done on behalf of the Committee.

40. Mr. PROTITCH (Under-Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs), as Secretary of the Committee, expressed his gratitude and that of the Secretariat for the appreciation shown of the work done by the Secretariat in the discharge of its duties, and also thanked all members of delegations for making that task so pleasant.

41. The CHAIRMAN concluded by thanking all those representatives who had offered condolences in regard to the earthquake disaster in Iran and who had spoken such kind words about him and the other officers of the Committee.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.