



Monday, 30 November 1953,  
 at 10.30 a.m.

New York

**C O N T E N T S**

Page

Tribute to the memory of Sir Benegal Narsing Rau ....	333
Measures to avert the threat of a new world war and to reduce tension in international relations: report of the First Committee .....	333

*President: Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi PANDIT (India).*

**Tribute to the memory of Sir Benegal Narsing Rau**

1. The PRESIDENT: I am sure that the members of this Assembly have learned with deep regret of the death of Sir Benegal Rau, Judge of the International Court of Justice.

2. Sir Benegal Rau was a distinguished member of the Court, and prior to that he played a prominent role in other activities of the United Nations and in many different capacities made a significant contribution to the development of this Organization. In this passing not only India has lost one of its outstanding statesmen, but the United Nations has been deprived of the services of one of its loyal supporters.

3. I am sure that I interpret the sentiments of the Assembly in expressing to the President of the Court and his colleagues the condolences of this body, and when I ask the delegation of India to accept and to transmit to the Government of India our expressions of sympathy in this grievous loss.

4. I invite the Assembly to stand for one minute in silent tribute to the memory of Sir Benegal Narsing Rau.

*The representatives stood in silence.*

**Measures to avert the threat of a new world war and to reduce tension in international relations: report of the First Committee (A/2579)**

[Agenda item 73]

*Mr. Thors (Iceland), Rapporteur of the First Committee, presented the report of that Committee (A/2579).*

5. The PRESIDENT: As the Rapporteur has pointed out in his report, no resolution is recommended by the First Committee for adoption by the Assembly. However, under this item the Soviet Union has submitted a draft resolution [A/L.168]. That is the only proposal before the Assembly, and I shall therefore put it to the vote.

6. I understand that it is the desire of some delegations to request the opening of a debate on this item. In view of the action taken by the Assembly on the question of debating the Committee reports on our

agenda, I would hope that it may be possible to proceed with this item in the same manner as we have dealt with the other Committee reports. If this course is agreeable to the Assembly, I would be prepared to apply in a more liberal manner the customary limitation on the length of explanations of vote.

7. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): As far as my delegation is concerned, we have no desire to have the rules interpreted in a more liberal manner, but think it would be appropriate to conduct this business under the same limitations as have customarily applied heretofore.

8. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United States will remember that we have in the past taken this more lenient view on other questions and, if there is no objection, I think we might extend it in the present instance.

9. Mr. NASZKOWSKI (Poland) (*translated from Russian*): The Polish delegation considers that in view of the great importance of this question for peace and international co-operation, the draft resolution of the Soviet Union [A/L.168] ought to be discussed by the General Assembly in plenary meeting.

10. Our understanding of the decision taken by the General Assembly on 27 November [458th meeting] not to discuss certain questions was that it referred to earlier items on the agenda and did not affect the Soviet proposals, which are of particular significance.

11. For these reasons, and on the basis of rule 67 of the rules of procedure, I formally propose that the USSR draft resolution should be discussed in plenary meeting.

12. Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom): With the very greatest respect, my delegation does not quite see why this item should enjoy any particular status in this respect. It seems to us that it is really rule 67 which should apply in these matters, or it should not apply. In this case, I think, it should apply. But of course, it is always open to the President to be lenient in the sense that actually she is always lenient to us in our activities here. An explanation of vote, I seem to remember, has not always been limited to precisely seven minutes in the past, and no doubt it will not be limited to precisely seven minutes in the future. But if we definitely take a decision to be "lenient", as a sort of special decision, what we will have in practice is a debate on a matter which it has already been decided not to debate. That seems to my delegation—with the greatest respect—to be a somewhat illogical position for us to take up. Let us therefore assume that the President will be as lenient as she always is, and let us proceed not to debate this matter but to explain our votes. That is my suggestion.

13. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet

delegation is grateful to the President for her proposal that a certain latitude should be permitted in the discussion on so important a question as the one it has submitted for consideration by the General Assembly. The Soviet delegation does not, however, claim any leniency which might in any way be construed as a violation of the rules of procedure. We have always maintained that the Assembly should scrupulously abide by the Charter and the rules of procedure, although the Assembly has very often allowed this requirement to be disregarded and has at times failed to abide by the laws prescribed for us in our Charter and rules of procedure.

14. In the present instance, I should just like to reply to Sir Gladwyn Jebb's remark that a decision was taken not to open discussion on questions referred to the General Assembly by the Main Committees. I have before me a Press release dated 27 November in which it is stated that the President asked whether there were any requests concerning the discussion of any of the questions forwarded from the Main Committees, and that there were no requests. This is not at all the same thing as saying that the General Assembly had taken a decision not to open a debate. All it means is that at that time there were no requests to open a debate on any particular question.

15. Now, however, I fully support the proposal of the President and of the Polish representative that so important a question as "measures to avert the threat of a new world war and to reduce tension in international relations" should not be passed over in silence by our Assembly. On such a question the views of delegations should be heard even though our proposals were not adopted in the First Committee.

16. We therefore believe that without any violation of the rules of procedure we are entitled to ask for an opportunity to state our views on the question before the Assembly. This would not take up very much time, but would be very useful and would in any case be a mark of respect towards the position occupied by the minority in this Organization. That position, which is in conformity with the Charter, has prompted that minority to strive unceasingly for co-operation among peoples, for international security, for a lessening of tension in international relations, and, finally, for the removal of the threat of a new world war—a threat which is very near and to which all peace-loving peoples are exposed.

17. The PRESIDENT: After consulting the verbatim record of the 458th meeting, I find the following: that, pursuant to rule 67 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss a number of items, including item 73, of the agenda of the General Assembly. In view of this and of what has been said by various representatives, I feel that we may proceed with the item on the basis of the interpretation I gave at the outset.

18. I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

19. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): Under rule 88 of our rules of procedure, the provision is made that "the President shall not permit the proposer of a proposal or of an amendment to explain his vote on his own proposal or amendment". I submit that that stands in the way of the representative of the Soviet Union making a speech about this Soviet item

which, of course, was considered and rejected in committee.

20. The PRESIDENT: I think that the representative of the United States is right in interpreting rule 88, but there have been exceptions to this rule of which I am sure all members are aware. I should therefore like to consult the Assembly as to whether it is willing to hear the Soviet Union representative speak on his proposal.

*A vote was taken by show of hands.*

21. The PRESIDENT: The voting is 12 in favour, 19 against, with 16 abstentions. The motion is therefore lost and rule 88 is applied to the debate.

22. Mr. NASZKOWSKI (Poland) (*translated from Russian*): In explaining my vote on the Soviet draft resolution, I should like to say that of all the various items on the agenda of the General Assembly's eighth session, the most important are those concerning the preservation of peace and international security. The United Nations should devote special attention to these questions at the present time when the conclusion of an armistice in Korea has confirmed the indubitable fact that it is possible to settle by negotiation the outstanding problems disturbing the relations between peoples and has opened the way towards wider agreements for the purpose of removing the threat of a new world war.

23. This incontrovertible truth was indeed confirmed by the adoption by the First Committee of the first paragraph of the preamble of the Soviet Union draft resolution, which noted that "the cessation of hostilities in Korea is an important contribution to the reduction of tension in international relations, and that it has created more favourable conditions for further action to avert the threat of a new world war".

24. Nevertheless, the majority of representatives on the First Committee failed to draw the proper conclusions from that fact, for they rejected the Soviet proposals as a whole, even though their adoption would have meant a real step in the direction of the maintenance of peace and the strengthening of co-operation among peoples. The debate in the First Committee revealed that the United States and other members of the North Atlantic bloc not only refused to adopt the peace proposals of the USSR, but also refused even to discuss them in substance.

25. The representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and certain other States failed to produce any concrete or convincing arguments against the USSR proposals on such fundamental problems as the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction, the reduction of armed forces, the elimination of military bases in foreign territory and the cessation of war propaganda designed to incite hatred and enmity between peoples. They could not conceal their unwillingness to settle such problems but, lacking arguments, they resorted to insinuations against the USSR and the peoples' democracies and attempted to distort the meaning of the Soviet proposals and to justify in the eyes of the world their continued pursuit of a policy of military preparation. They sought to pass off as harmless defence measures their policy of rearmament and the formation of aggressive blocs, their hostility towards the People's Republic of China and the rearmament of the bankrupt Kuomintang clique on



Taiwan, a clique which is a dangerous focus of aggression, arming, as it does, the pirate bands in Burma and organizing attacks on peaceful merchant ships such as the Polish ship *Praca* which, with its crew, is still illegally detained at Taiwan. The peace proposals of the Soviet Union, on the other hand, were dubbed mere propaganda moves which, it was affirmed, would hinder the reduction of tension in international relations.

26. Notwithstanding these hypocritical remarks, the Soviet Union proposals offer a real possibility of reducing international tension, since they would help to release mankind from the terrible threat of recourse to weapons of mass destruction and from the burden of armaments production, and would open the way towards the elimination from foreign territory of military bases, the very presence of which increases tension and undermines the sovereign rights of the States on whose territory they are constructed. Lastly, the Soviet proposals are designed to call a halt to the war-mongering propaganda which has been poisoning the international atmosphere and increasing the difficulty of establishing peaceful relations among nations.

27. Besides these peace proposals made in our Organization there have been many other demonstrations of the peace-loving policy of the USSR, the latest being its note of 26 November addressed to the Governments of the three Western Powers. This note once more points out the means of ensuring the security of Europe, whose peoples are again threatened by the danger of militaristic and vengeful forces growing in Western Germany with the active encouragement of United States ruling circles.

28. The Polish delegation represents a country which endured the terrors of Hitlerite occupation and which passionately longs for peace. In its note of 25 November to the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom, the Polish Government stated that Poland was deeply concerned to prevent the resurgence of aggressive forces in Germany and to see the settlement of the German problem on democratic and peaceful bases. There can be no doubt that the adoption of the Soviet proposals for the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction and the reduction of armaments would make it easier to solve other important problems, including that of Germany.

29. The Polish people expects the United Nations to take measures to create the conditions for a lasting peace, international security and peaceful co-operation among peoples. The Polish delegation will therefore vote in favour of the Soviet Union draft resolution, for it is deeply convinced that in so doing it will serve the cause of the sovereignty of its own country as well as the common cause of peace and co-operation among nations.

30. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): For the benefit of those representatives who have not been here before this year, it may be useful to explain that the item before the General Assembly is that hardly perennial called the "Soviet item". It is purely a propaganda proposition, not introduced with a serious purpose of serious action, but solely as a peg on which to hang a number of speeches with a view to getting them into the Press of the world. This is considered by some to be very clever politics. Others, among whom the present speaker wishes to be included, con-

sider it an inadequate response to the challenge of the hour. Not content with taking a week in the First Committee, where the draft resolution was rejected, it has been reintroduced here so as to get another free ride in the Press of the world.

31. The main purpose of this exercise is to utter more or less elaborate untruths about the United States, which, I suppose, is a sort of backhanded compliment, but it is one, frankly, which we could do without, because when untruths are uttered, as they have been in this case for more than a week, they have to be rebutted, and thus much valuable time is wasted. I think it was Hamlet who said, in another context, "it is a weary, stale, flat and unprofitable" business.

32. Therefore, in this spirit, we briefly take note of the fact that in their speeches the Soviet-bloc speakers, among other things, attacked the military arrangements recently concluded between the United States Government and the Government of Spain. These arrangements are nothing new, but the touchiness of the Soviet-bloc speakers may be due to the fact that, of course, it was the Soviet Union which made an unsuccessful attempt to conquer Spain for communism some years ago. They must know that these purely defensive agreements with Spain, like all other military arrangements in Europe with which the United States is connected, need never have taken place had it not been for the feeling in Western Europe since the Second World War that there was a danger of new military aggression. The Soviet-bloc speakers might well ask themselves the extent to which the policies of their governments have had anything to do with that feeling of danger in Western Europe.

33. These accusations come strangely from a representative of a Power which, in 1939, concluded a pact with Hitler, shared with Hitler the complete conquest of Poland, and, by securing Hitler's eastern flank, freed him for his incredibly destructive aggression against Western Europe. Remembering this, one cannot help asking why the agreement with Spain looks aggressive to the Soviet bloc. One infers it is because the military agreements with which they are most familiar have indeed been aggressive.

34. Extreme sensitivity was displayed to the wounds inflicted by the Spanish Blue Division in the Second World War, but the Soviet Union Government finds it easy to overlook completely the wounds inflicted at Stalingrad by the Nazi army group led by Field Marshal von Paulus.

35. In the spirit of the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact of such repulsive memory, the leader of this very German army, Field Marshal von Paulus, now occupies an important military post in the communist government of Eastern Germany. Trained for eight years in Soviet political methods, he is now the trusted ally—or perhaps it would be more accurate to say the instrument—of the Soviet Union in the puppet government of Eastern Germany. In this same puppet government they have placed as chief of military forces the former Lieutenant General Vincenz Muehler, and installed many other high nazi officers. The wounds inflicted by the German armies which fought under these leaders are forgotten by the Soviet Union because nazi skills have proved to be so readily adaptable to communist uses.

36. When I learned these facts I concluded that, really, the Soviet Union was about the last country on earth to point a finger at anyone about the free world succumbing to fascism.

37. Now a word about hate-mongering. In connexion with the paragraph on that subject the charge is made—of all things—that the United States Government was responsible for the riots in East Berlin. Believe it or not. Actually, it is the Soviet Union Government which must take the lion's share of the credit for the events which took place in East Berlin in June of this year, for, in all truth, it was responsible for a régime in East Germany so harsh and so lethal to all hope of freedom that the people of East Berlin found it easier to fight tanks with their bare hands than to endure the cruelties of their communist masters. The most skilled pleader cannot create that kind of courage. It cannot be bought. It is the result of desperation, of a situation where death seems like a blessed relief. It was the Soviet Union Government which put hundreds of former Nazis, trained in the Soviet Union, into the East German police forces. These were the police who fled before the scorn and rage of their fellow countrymen in East Berlin and throughout East Germany, and no other outside instigation was needed to turn the everyday little people of Germany against such men as these.

38. In connexion with hate-mongering, the Soviet Union cites the United States Press. There is one difference between the position of the United States Press and that of the Soviet Union Press which is basic. It is that when the United States Press speaks, it speaks for itself, and when the Soviet Union Press speaks, it speaks for the Soviet Union Government. Consider this quotation from the 14 November edition of *Sovietskaya Byelorussiya* containing the review of a motion picture entitled "Silvery Dust", the picture that portrays all of us in the United States as monsters. This review describes the picture as "a militant satire on the two-legged jackals of the American camp of war" and depicts it as "unmasking and scouring the ferocious enemies of humanity". That is us. This is the official doctrine about my country from a government which accuses us of hate-mongering, from a government whose Prime Minister, Mr. Malenkov, speaks of "peaceful co-existence".

39. The United States delegation will vote against the Soviet Union draft resolution, a draft resolution which was decisively defeated in the First Committee and should not have been reintroduced here—or, for that matter, introduced at all.

40. Mr. DAVID (Czechoslovakia) (*translated from Russian*): I do not think there is any need to reply to Mr. Lodge's provocative fabrications and to all the insulting remarks made here about the Soviet Union, for everyone knows what an immense contribution the Soviet Union made to the destruction of the hitlerite fascists.

41. The Czechoslovak delegation earlier declared, during the discussion in the First Committee on the USSR draft resolution on "measures to avert the threat of a new world war and to reduce tension in international relations", that the proposals submitted by the USSR delegation enjoyed its full support.

42. Recently, when the peoples of the entire world were joyfully welcoming the conclusion of the armistice

in Korea, which did much to reduce international tension, we witnessed the unhappy spectacle of the international reactionary forces, led by the reactionary circles of the United States, doing their utmost to prevent the slackening of international tension and the peaceful settlement of international disputes, to complicate the international situation and to increase tension in international relations. The USSR delegation's proposals, containing as they do effective measures to avert the threat of a new war and to reduce international tension, are therefore particularly appropriate. They correspond to the vital interests of the peoples of the entire world, and therefore constitute the most important item of all on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly.

43. On several occasions during the eighth session of the General Assembly the Czechoslovak delegation has expressed its conviction that, in the interests of further reducing international tension and re-establishing trust among nations, it is essential to take effective steps as speedily as possible to bring about the universal regulation and reduction of armaments, as well as to declare atomic, hydrogen and other types of weapons of mass destruction to be unconditionally prohibited and to establish strict international control of enforcement of that prohibition. The peoples of the whole world are even more insistently demanding that these problems be settled with the utmost dispatch, since the constant increase in armaments expenditure, and the threat of the use of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction, are not only a heavy burden that very seriously lowers the workers' standard of living in the capitalist countries, but are also beyond question a dangerous threat to universal peace. The proposals contained in the draft resolution submitted by the USSR delegation completely answer the expectations of all peace-loving men and women, who desire whole-heartedly a reduction of armaments, an end to the armaments race and the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction. The USSR draft resolution at the same time very properly indicates that the five permanent members of the Security Council ought to effect a reduction of their armaments first.

44. In addition, the establishment of a network of United States military, naval and air bases in the territories of foreign States, particularly on the frontiers of the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies, is a serious threat to international peace and security. These military bases undermine the sovereignty of the States on whose territory they are established and constitute an integral part of the military preparations against the USSR and the peoples' democracies. In the interests of reducing international tension, therefore, these United States military bases must be eliminated, in accordance with the USSR draft resolution.

45. Furthermore, if we are to have normal international relations, the General Assembly must condemn the propaganda of hatred and enmity between nations that is being carried on in certain countries, a propaganda which is undermining international co-operation and is contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations. The reactionary circles, especially in the United States, which are conducting hostile propaganda against the USSR and the peoples' democracies, are inventing stories about an imaginary danger of attack by the USSR. These

stories are false from start to finish and have only one purpose—to scare the people of the countries whose governments play the most prominent part in the armaments race. The dissemination of this propaganda is poisoning international relations and serves only to increase international tension by helping to create an atmosphere of fear and mutual distrust among nations.

46. The Czechoslovak delegation has already emphasized that the people of Czechoslovakia, like the other peoples of Europe, is disquieted by the establishment and extension of the network of United States military bases in Europe. The peoples of Europe fear these measures all the more because the establishment of United States military bases is directly connected with the plans of the United States ruling circles for the remilitarization of Western Germany. The object of these plans is to make the western part of the territory of Germany into a base where the plans of revenge harboured by the German militarists will be put into effect and a new war prepared. There is no doubt whatever that the question whether Germany is to be a democratic and peace-loving or an aggressive and revenge-seeking country is one which affects the very existence as nations of all Germany's neighbours, both to the west and to the east.

47. At the present moment, when the settlement of the principal controversial international questions by peaceful negotiations is once again a possibility, and the USSR is doing its utmost to ensure that the first steps are taken towards settling controversial international questions through direct negotiations between the great Powers, so that international tension may be reduced, the proposals submitted by the USSR delegation to the eighth session of the General Assembly are of particular importance. They show how the United Nations, on its side, can help to strengthen peace and international security.

48. Certain delegations that opposed the USSR draft resolution in the First Committee tried, without so much as going into the substance of the proposed measures, to detract from the cogency and force of the USSR proposals by saying that the USSR had already submitted similar proposals before. Mr. Lodge adopted the same approach here a few moments ago. These delegations, which have shown by their attitude that they do not have the cause of peace and of strengthening international security at heart, deliberately ignore the fact that what is of decisive importance in the endeavour to avert the threat of a new world war and to reduce tension in international relations is not whether the proposals have been made already, but how far such measures correspond to the vital interests of the nations.

49. Further, in the course of the debate on the subject in the First Committee, certain delegations objected that the measures proposed in the USSR draft resolution were to be discussed in the Disarmament Commission and that there was therefore no need for action by the General Assembly. Such objections will not, however, bear criticism. To act as those delegations desire would mean depriving one of the main organs of the United Nations, the General Assembly, whose recommendations have immense moral weight, of its chief function, that of discussing and deciding important questions relating to peace and security, such as measures to avert the threat of a new world war and reducing international tension.

50. The USSR delegation's proposals are a valuable contribution to the cause of peace and security. The Czechoslovak delegation whole-heartedly supports them, for they show the United Nations the road it must take if it wishes to help strengthen peace and international security. The proposals submitted by the USSR delegation are also fully in accordance with the wishes of the Czechoslovak nation and all peace-loving people, who regard the strengthening of peace as a guarantee for the future happiness of mankind. The adoption of these proposals would undoubtedly help the United Nations to carry out its main tasks, increase its authority and lead to a considerable reduction in international tension. For these reasons the Czechoslovak delegation unreservedly supports the draft resolution submitted by the USSR delegation.

51. Mr. TORIELLO GARRIDO (Guatemala) (*translated from Spanish*): The delegation of Guatemala has before it the draft resolution of the USSR [A/L.168], concerning measures to avert the threat of a new world war and to reduce tension in international relations. After a careful study of the document, it has reached certain conclusions, one of which is that many of the elements embodied in this draft are already contained in the operative part of resolution 715 (VIII), for which the Guatemalan delegation voted. For that reason, my delegation will vote in favour of some of the ideas expressed in the USSR draft, and it will abstain on others. For the reasons I have already given, it will also abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

52. Nevertheless, I should like to make a statement on behalf of my delegation with respect to paragraph 4 of the document. In the first part of the paragraph there are some highly important elements. The General Assembly, according to that paragraph, "condemns the propaganda which is being conducted in a number of countries with the aim of inciting enmity and hatred among nations. . . ." If that sentence were followed immediately by the final words "and calls upon all States to take measures to put a stop to such propaganda, which is incompatible with the fundamental purposes and principles of the United Nations", my delegation would vote in favour of it; but a new element has been embodied in it: "and preparing a new world war".

53. The Guatemalan delegation does not believe there is any country so devoid of reason as to be preparing a new world war, which would be contrary to all the peaceful aspirations of the peoples and would undoubtedly lead mankind to its own destruction, by the very nature of the newly-invented weapons. My delegation feels that the other elements of the paragraph are true, for some countries are in fact carrying out propaganda to incite enmity and hatred among nations and peoples.

54. Guatemala is the victim of a campaign by the Press and other information media in the United States. A slanderous and tendentious campaign has been unleashed against us, which I denounced last year in the Third Committee in the discussion on problems of freedom of information, and this year when I spoke on behalf of my country before the Assembly a few weeks ago [442nd meeting]. The campaign grows more violent every day. I have here a collection of articles published in recent weeks in the following American papers: The *New York Times*, the *Washing-*



*ton Post*, the *Christian Science Monitor*, the *Evening Star*, the *Daily News*, the *New York Herald Tribune*, the *Wall Street Journal*, *U. S. News & World Report*, *Time*, *La Prensa* of New York, *Visión* and *Radio Reports*.

55. I do not propose to discuss these articles in detail, but I would point out that Guatemala, a small country about the size of the state of Maine in the United States, with an area of 42,000 square miles and a population of 3 million people, is committing no greater "crime" than that of wanting to achieve its economic independence; and in the struggle to achieve that end it is seeking to do away with the privileges which a United States monopoly called the United Fruit Company acquired in Guatemala over half a century ago. We are struggling, among other things, to open a route to the Atlantic coast, in order to export our own products without being dependent on the United Fruit Company, which exercises its monopoly over my country's only railway and its ports. For however incredible this may appear to world opinion, the ports, the railway and the international telephone and telegraph services of my country are in the hands of that company.

56. The struggle of Guatemala is a democratic struggle in keeping with the principles of international law and the sovereign laws of my country. All we demand of the United States monopoly is that it should respect the laws of the republic. The ignominious record of monopolies of the type of the United Fruit Company, which, thanks to malpractice and privilege, have extended their operations throughout the Caribbean area and Central America, is well known in America.

57. An example of the propaganda which the company has unleashed against my country to avoid being obliged to obey the law is to be found in the volume of cuttings I have here. This propaganda is conducted by certain groups of monopolies which control newspapers in the United States. I shall read what the *Evening Star* has gone so far as to insinuate:

"1. Appeasement. Financial aid and other means to win Guatemala from communism. This has been ruled out on the grounds that it would not work.

"2. A do-nothing policy. This is considered dangerous in the face of a situation that is steadily becoming worse.

"3. Blustering gestures such as breaking off diplomatic relations. This would not be likely to achieve realistic results.

"4. Economic sanctions. At first glance this might seem like a good move, since most of Guatemala's exports go to the United States and most of her imports come from here. But experts do not believe that a United States boycott would be sufficient to cripple the Guatemalan economy.

"5. A policy of non-co-operation. This has been adopted already. It means cutting off from Guatemala any benefits normally going to other American republics, such as Point Four aid. It also has meant halting work on the Inter-American highway in Guatemala.

"6. Trying to persuade other American republics to take collective action against the communist menace in Guatemala. There has been considerable work toward this end, but it is not promising."

58. As you can see, the purpose of this propaganda is to try by any and every means to put an end to the revolution in Guatemala and to stamp out the democratic movement of a small country which has had the audacity to want to be independent, the audacity to want to control its own destiny in accordance with sovereign standards and in accordance with the principles and postulates laid down in the Charter of the Organization of American States and in the United Nations Charter.

59. For that reason, I said that my delegation could vote in favour of paragraph 4 of the USSR draft resolution, which condemns "the propaganda which is being conducted in a number of countries with the aim of inciting enmity and hatred among nations" and "calls upon all States to take measures to put a stop to such propaganda, which is incompatible with the fundamental purposes and principles of the United Nations". But the paragraph includes the words "and preparing a new world war", an idea which we have no reason to consider because we are sure that the propaganda unleashed against Guatemala, the slanderous attacks on us by the United States Press, are not made for the purpose of preparing a war against my country. What, then, is being prepared? Something more serious is being prepared against my country: an intervention which has already begun by an economic aggression clearly declared by certain official circles in the United States Government. The *Evening Star*, moreover, asks other Latin-American countries to "take . . . action" against the threat which Guatemala represents, and, with other papers, calls Guatemala a threat to the Panama Canal, to the American continent, to the security of the hemisphere and the security of the United States.

60. A nation like Guatemala with an honourable well-disciplined army of no more than 3,000 men to defend its democratic institutions; with neither a strong air force nor a navy; with no strategic roads; and whose railroads and ports have been in the hands of the United Fruit company for more than fifty years, cannot be the danger it is said to be. Yet they have the cynicism to call Guatemala a threat to the American continent.

61. I do not think this is fair, and what worries us most is that this campaign should be conducted in a country with democratic traditions like the United States, for whose people Guatemala has great admiration, and with whose government we maintain very good diplomatic relations. It is a fact, however, that there are officials connected with the State Department who have personal interests in the United Fruit Company and who are using the Press, and their influence in the government, to attack Guatemala.

62. I am making this formal denunciation of the slanderous campaign against Guatemala, as I have done on other occasions, in the hope that the people of the United States will realize the injustice of such attacks. My delegation deeply regrets that paragraph 4 of this draft resolution includes the phrase "and preparing a new world war". For where small countries are concerned, the purpose of such a campaign of slander is not to make war on them, but to create enmity and hatred among nations in order to justify an intervention.

63. For all these reasons, my delegation will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

64. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) (*translated from Spanish*): When the USSR amendments to the fourteen-Power draft resolution were submitted to the First Committee, my delegation voted against them and stated in detail its reasons for so doing. I feel I should repeat in the General Assembly some of the considerations which governed our attitude.

65. The draft resolution now submitted by the Soviet Union [A/L.168] contains elements which are also contained in resolution 715 (VIII), which was adopted by a large majority and on which the USSR abstained.

66. At that time we placed before the First Committee an argument which we think a very cogent one and which was not answered on that occasion. It is necessary that I repeat that argument here. The USSR delegation agrees that a general declaration on the prohibition of atomic weapons and all means of mass destruction would constitute only a moral obligation, and in the discussion on disarmament, it agreed that such a prohibition could become binding in law only if a legal instrument were signed establishing effective international control. There was thus a sort of consensus in the Committee that a general prohibition based only on the good faith and honour of countries was not an effective method, but that the effective method—and we must seek such a method by all possible means—would be the signing, as soon as possible, of a legal instrument guaranteeing the prohibition of atomic weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction by means of effective international control.

67. Since, therefore, the feeling of the Committee seems to have been that the important thing is to conclude, as a matter of urgency, an instrument containing a legal obligation which would constitute an effective international guarantee, it is clear that a mere moral recommendation must take second place, as being ineffective. And I then put the following question, which has not been answered and to which I believe there is no reply: is a moral recommendation in such cases merely repetitive or is it a substitute? If repetitive, it is purposeless, since we have already, in the draft resolution of the First Committee, urged the need for the signature, as soon as possible, of a legal instrument prohibiting the atomic weapon and all other weapons of mass destruction, together with an international guarantee. If, however, it is not merely repetitive, and if it is thought—or if people wish to think, or allow themselves to think—that it would be very difficult to conclude such an instrument and that it would therefore be better, for the time being, to adopt a moral obligation instead, my delegation considers such an attitude not only futile but dangerous. Nothing would be more undesirable than to lull public opinion into a false sense of security resulting from the belief that a prohibition had been achieved, and to postpone indefinitely the only prohibition that can be effective, the signature of an agreement embodying an international guarantee.

68. In reply to the USSR draft, I therefore put the following dilemma: either we are being asked to repeat what we have already done, in which case it is pointless repetition, or, alternatively, we are being invited to place ourselves in a position we cannot and must not accept—for honour's sake and in the interests of mankind—namely, that it is impossible to conclude

a legal instrument prohibiting the atomic weapon and accompanied by an international guarantee.

69. My delegation rejects that part of the USSR proposal because it is certain that by so doing we shall oblige the Disarmament Commission to submit in any case to the next session of the General Assembly a draft treaty on the prohibition of atomic weapons and all weapons of mass destruction. We shall also be placing on all countries, more especially on the countries directly concerned, an obligation to refrain from setting any obstacle, or from adopting any delaying measure or pretext, that might hinder the adoption of such an instrument.

70. That is why my delegation opposes a grandiloquent prohibition, which is purely verbal and is obviously intended for propaganda purposes. Its effect would be to lull public opinion to sleep and to reduce the urgency of the instructions which we have given the Disarmament Commission. We would wish those instructions to have special weight with the countries that possess the atomic secret, so that they would relinquish their excessive concern about national sovereignty and accept effective international control.

71. My delegation also opposes the other recommendations in the USSR draft since they involve, particularly those in paragraph 3, a criticism of what we have called the defensive attitude of the West against the USSR. The truth is that that instinctive defensive attitude of Western Europe, and of the western world in general, towards the Soviet Union, has been demonstrated by the construction of military bases, cannot be condemned, nor can the prevailing international tension be ascribed to it. When the question was under study in the First Committee, my delegation showed that before ever the West adopted defence measures, there had been not only international tension but fear, almost despair, because the European balance of power had been upset, a state of affairs which still prevails. I say without hostility towards anyone, and quite dispassionately, that international tension exists whenever the balance is upset. Such a situation arose when the Soviet Union advanced, in pursuance of its ambition, from Stettin to the Adriatic, and when, upsetting the structure of Europe, established by the Congress of Vienna and consolidated and perfected later, it proceeded, after the Second World War, to create for the Balkan countries a system completely different from that former system of independence, to eliminate from those countries all traces of the influence of the free world, and to subject them to its own exclusive influence by placing them under its economic and military control.

72. That, naturally, produced international tension; it produced a state of anxiety in Europe. Another cause of tension and of fear was opposition to the Marshall Plan, which Europe needed, whereas the Soviet Union preferred a hungry Europe to a free Europe.

73. Thus all the measures taken by the West—the Marshall Plan, aid to Greece and Turkey, the Brussels Pact, the North Atlantic Treaty, or resistance to the Berlin blockade—were instinctive and legitimate measures intended to achieve peace by restoring the balance. Consequently, it cannot be maintained that the reaction in Europe brought about the international tension. On the contrary, I am absolutely and sincerely

convinced that the slightest change in Europe's defence efforts would lead to further international tension. That fact was well brought out by Mr. Robert Schuman in the French National Assembly when he said that the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty had been responsible, a few days after its signature, for the lifting of the Berlin blockade. Quite recently we were given an object lesson on this subject which we must not forget; the announcement of the Bermuda Conference seems already, according to the Soviet note in answer to the Allied Powers, to have induced the USSR to discuss the German problem, which it has so far refused to discuss.

74. In the same way, it was the heroic resistance of the western Powers and the United Nations in defence of Korea that led to an armistice, which could never have been achieved merely by trying to reduce international tension. We agree with the USSR delegation when it states that the signing of the armistice brought about a decrease in international tension, and we ask it: why the armistice was signed. It was signed because the West had adopted a wise and heroic policy of resistance.

75. We view the matter objectively, because the small Powers are not unconcerned about peace, and can regard the problems it involves in a dispassionate and objective manner, free from animosity or antagonism. We consider that peace is based on two things: first, there must in effect be a balance, a restoration of the European balance which was disturbed as a result of the generous and trustful attitude of the Allied Powers after the war; and, secondly, a legal instrument must be adopted declaring the prohibition of atomic weapons and accompanied by international control. Those are two fundamental bases for peace, and they find no place in the Soviet draft resolution.

76. I know that there are other bases for peace as well which I have already mentioned: freedom of trade, about which the Soviet proposal does not speak, and with which the poorer countries are concerned: freedom of thought and intellectual relations, which the Soviet Union has so often opposed, drawing down an iron curtain which not only shuts out tourists but even prevents the communication of ideas. We are in favour of intellectual exchanges. The Soviet Union will, we hope, understand that the western Powers are moving towards social justice without any sacrifice of human freedom, as is shown by the programmes of reform adopted in all free countries, above all in those which are inspired by the ideal of Christian democracy. We hope and pray that the Soviet Union, without forsaking its ideals of social justice, may slowly move towards respect for individual freedom.

77. Finally, I wish to take this opportunity to say, as we have said before, that we do not regard the revival of religious persecution in Poland as a step towards peace. In the First Committee we were told in reply that the Catholic hierarchy in Poland had intervened in that country's political affairs. I can definitely say that that is not proven. The reason for the persecution is different. Poland stands for a magnificent western tradition, one based on the difference between spiritual and temporal things which was brilliantly described by Renan in a sentence quoted by André Siegfried: the fundamental difference

between the West and the East has in many cases been that saying of Christ's: "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's". But unfortunately Poland is now under the influence of a dual and an alien tradition, the Jacobin tradition which has invariably sought to give the temporal primacy over the spiritual, and the Byzantine tradition under which the Church is merely a branch of the political bureaucracy.

78. We would support paragraph 4 of the USSR draft resolution if that paragraph were not so badly drafted and if we did not know that, in countries where the Press is free, governments cannot be asked to control it. I repeat, if paragraph 4 were not so badly drafted, we would vote for it, because we are against incitement to hatred in any part of the world; we are in favour of incitement to understanding.

79. We support the policy of resistance adopted by Europe, because we consider it to be reasonable, but we do not believe that that policy will ever be one of antagonism, opposition, or hatred of the Soviet Union, nor do we desire that it should be so. On the contrary, the most eminent and most representative leaders of the European States made it quite clear that the measures they have taken are of a defensive character. They have even gone so far as to conceive the idea of a new Locarno, which would give the Soviet Union the certainty that its fundamental and vital interests would never be endangered. What we want is greater understanding and the achievement of a true rapprochement. We shall work for that, and that is why my delegation regrets that the Soviet draft resolution contains pointless or dangerous repetitions and indirectly condemns a policy of defence which we regard as a guarantee of stability and therefore of peace.

80. I should not be satisfied if I did not conclude with an appeal for peace, an appeal to the spirit of understanding. I hope that a policy based on the defence of legitimate interests and on the concept of the solidarity of all peoples, be they western or Asian, will halt the USSR in its course and will be an object lesson for it which will lead it to adopt a reasonable policy of peace and understanding.

81. Mr. BARANOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The proposals of the Soviet Union concerning "measures to avert the threat of a new world war and to reduce tension in international relations" submitted for study to the present session of the General Assembly are designed to resolve the major problem confronting the United Nations, the problem of reducing the existing tension in international relations and removing the threat of a new world war.

82. While the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies are trying to find ways of easing the present tension in international relations, aggressive circles in the United States are intensifying the cold war, speeding up the armaments race and making every effort to complete the military programme of the North Atlantic bloc, thereby clearly working for the deterioration of relations with the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies.

83. As a psychological preparation for the new complications in international relations which certain circles in the United States are provoking, a blast of



propaganda against the peoples' democracies has recently been let loose in that country. Once again in the United States public appeals are heard inciting to hysteria and stirring up hatred and enmity among nations. With clearly provocative and propagandist aims in view, a mendacious story is being circulated concerning the allegedly increasing threat of "Soviet military might" and concerning some mythical increase in the Soviet armed forces; other slanderous inventions of the same kind are also being circulated. The purpose of all this is to influence public opinion in the United States and in the world at large. It was also in order to stir up hatred and enmity towards the countries of the democratic camp that a number of defamatory inventions were submitted to the General Assembly for discussion; for instance, the charges that the Soviet Union was retaining prisoners of war and using slave labour, and the question of so-called atrocities committed against American prisoners of war.

84. The war-mongering character of all this flood of propaganda in the United States is admitted even by the American Press. Such provocative and slanderous aims clearly inspired today's speech by the United States representative, consisting only of impudent slander against the Soviet Union, to answer which would be beneath our dignity. The heroic epic of Stalingrad is impervious to libel. The Soviet people in the battles at Stalingrad saved the world from the fascist plague and that great victory which decided the fate of the world is remembered with recognition and gratitude by all humanity. Only men dead to all shame could try to cast aspersions on the shining memory of the heroes of that battle.

85. However, there are some passages of the United States representative's speech at our meeting today that cannot be ignored. Mr. Lodge endeavoured to justify the aggressive treaty concluded by the United States with Franco's Spain. Naturally, we were not surprised by that new proof of the aggressive tendencies of certain circles in the United States; it only confirmed our belief concerning the aggressive character of present United States policy. The conclusion of an agreement with Franco's Spain continues the policy adopted by certain circles in the United States of America of using fascist forces of aggression to unleash a new world war. In accordance with this trend, hitlerite war criminals condemned by an international tribunal have been released from prison on the orders of the United States Government. The United States has taken under its protection and exempted from trial men who should have been condemned for war crimes against humanity. From among these Nazis, the United States is now recruiting the leaders of the present government of Western Germany, which is bent on revenge, and of the West German Wehrmacht which they are setting up again.

86. In preparation for a war against the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies, the United States aggressive circles are entering into contact with and seeking the support of the Government of Franco's Spain, a government which has been branded as fascist by a resolution [39 (I)] of the General Assembly for which the United States, amongst others, voted. Now the United States is placing itself at the head of all the most reactionary and aggressive forces, all the vengeful and fascist elements, any kind of scoundrel, in fact, who is ready to fight against the Soviet Union

and the peoples' democracies. This fact must be realized by all the peoples of the world, and the representative of the United States will not succeed in hiding it from international public opinion by references to von Paulus and other nonsense of that kind.

87. The United States representative and the Peruvian representative have again repeated arguments which they evidently consider very convincing. As in the First Committee, they sought to stigmatize as propaganda the proposals of the Soviet Union concerning measures to avert the threat of a new world war. It is of course correct that some of the measures included in the Soviet proposal had been submitted for consideration to the United Nations at previous sessions, but this fact need surely not prevent their careful study and adoption at the present session.

88. The fact that the Soviet proposals were not adopted in the past only shows the stubbornness with which the forces of aggression are opposing the efforts of the peoples to strengthen peace and ensure their own security. These forces, hostile to peace, have so far succeeded, in the United Nations, in defeating all measures for preventing the outbreak of a new world war. But who can assert that the decisions of earlier sessions of the General Assembly, taken under pressure of the United States and the countries of the North Atlantic bloc, really express the attitude of the peoples of the world to the Soviet proposals for peace? How can such an assertion be made when we know that the demand of the Soviet Union for the prohibition of atomic and other weapons of mass destruction and for the effective reduction of the armaments and armed forces of the five great Powers, as well as its other proposals aimed at eliminating the causes of international tension, are supported by hundreds of millions of people in every part of the world?

89. The rejection, in the past, of Soviet proposals designed to avert the threat of a new world war was a serious mistake on the part of the United Nations. That rejection has served only to encourage the international forces of aggression to intensify the armaments race and has undoubtedly helped to increase international tension. If the proposals of the Soviet Union had been accepted by the General Assembly and implemented in good faith, the forces of aggression would have been seriously weakened and the danger of another world war would have been warded off for a long time to come.

90. The aggressive circles of the United States, as they urge their own country and the countries dependent on it to intensify the arms race, are still endeavouring to pass off their aggressive military preparations as measures to defend the countries of the "free world", motivated by their concern to safeguard the security of the area in which the national interests of the United States are involved. We asked the United States delegation in the First Committee what the frontiers of that area were, but we received no answer. Will there never be an end to the extension of those frontiers? The interests of the United States are continually expanding and penetrating to regions of the world remote from the United States, engulfing more and more of the territory of other States. How can it seriously be contended that the establishment of United States military airfields in Iceland, Greenland, in the Arctic wastes and in Canada, or of military bases in Turkey, Greece,

Pakistan, Morocco, Spain and many other territories, many thousands of miles away from the United States, is a defence measure to safeguard the security of the United States? Is it surprising that the extension of the network of United States military bases on foreign territories far beyond the confines of the United States is evoking apprehension and serious disquiet among all peace-loving peoples? When fresh military bases spring up close to the frontiers of the Soviet Union and French military agreements are concluded, we are put on our guard and draw the necessary conclusions. There is every reason for such vigilance.

91. The attitude of the United States delegation in the United Nations has revealed that aggressive circles in the United States do not desire any reduction of armaments. They are relying on preparations for an atomic war, dreaming of the use of atomic bombs for a so-called preventive attack on the Soviet Union. The public utterances of leading American political figures bear out the fact that such are their intentions; we alluded to them in the First Committee.

92. Now that the aggressive circles in the United States and some other countries are carried away by the atomic fever and are staking everything on making the atomic bomb the basic weapon of their armies, it is particularly important that steps should be taken to weaken the forces of aggression and disrupt the plans for the unleashing of a new world war.

93. The measures proposed by the Soviet Union aim at promoting settlement by peaceful means of those international problems which are at the root of the present international tension. The Soviet Union is again proposing that a declaration should be made prohibiting atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction, with the simultaneous introduction of strict international control to ensure observance of this prohibition. Together with the prohibition of the atomic weapon, the Soviet Union proposes that a recommendation should be made without delay to the five great Powers to reduce their armed forces by one-third within one year, and that thereafter an international conference should be called for the reduction of armaments by all States.

94. Whatever fantastic pretexts the countries of the Anglo-American bloc have used to disguise their attitude to this proposal, they will not succeed in concealing the fact that all the subterfuges to which they resort in their attempt to place responsibility for the arms race upon the Soviet Union are solely designed to enable them to elude the necessity of reducing their own armed forces, a reduction which is dictated not only by the interests of general security but also by the individual interests of the countries engaged in the armaments race, which are hardly able to bear the burden of armaments.

95. The question of the elimination of military, naval and air bases on foreign territories is most intimately connected with the proposal for the reduction of armaments. It is impossible, naturally, to imagine a serious reduction in tension in international relations as long as the United States and other Powers that follow the same road impose on various countries agreements in which they take the lion's share and which, in effect, form a basis for a military occupation, causing States to lose their national sovereignty and independence and to fall into foreign bondage. It is also, of course, impossible to speak of friendly international co-opera-

tion as long as there exist military bases which are aimed at the vital points of the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies, and which cause apprehension and disquiet among all peace-loving peoples.

96. The proposals of the Soviet Union are legitimate and timely, therefore, in recognizing that the creation of military bases on the territories of other States increases the threat of a new world war. The logical deduction from such a recognition is that measures should be taken by the Security Council for the elimination of those bases.

97. It is impossible to believe the policy of the United States and of the other western Powers is aimed at the relaxation of international tension or at peaceful collaboration with the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies, as long as propaganda is carried on in the territories of the western Powers which is overtly hostile to the democratic camp, stirring up hatred towards our countries and fostering the war psychosis which is supported by the international forces of aggression. Moreover, that propaganda of hatred and enmity is conducted not only against the countries of the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies, but against other countries, as the representative of Guatemala said clearly and vividly in his speech today. Such subversive activity against the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies deliberately carried on at the behest of influential people in certain countries, as part of the programme of the so-called peaceful liberation of the peoples of eastern Europe, is hardly compatible with friendly collaboration.

98. In view of the present tension in the international situation, the Soviet proposals are most timely and represent the minimum measures which can and should be taken to prevent the outbreak of a new world war and effectively reduce international tension. As it lends its support to the programme of constructive measures proposed by the Soviet Union to avert the threat of a new world war, the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR deems it essential to proclaim that it is not discouraged by the fact that the forces of aggression have once again succeeded, in the First Committee—and will possibly succeed in the General Assembly—in frustrating these peace proposals of the Soviet Union. We are fully convinced that these sincere and honest proposals are intended to ward off the threat of war which political and military adventurers are holding over the nations of the world and that they will pierce the curtain of lies and misinformation and find support among those States which are not interested in fomenting war but which set a high value on peace, for peace alone can bring tranquillity and prosperity to their peoples. As to the peoples themselves, they long ago said what they think. They resolutely support the Soviet Union's peace proposals.

99. Whether they want to or not, the exponents of the use of force in international relations must realize that the peoples of the world are not on their side, but insistently demand an end to the armaments race and to the aggravation of international relations and a return to normal international co-operation. The sooner this is realized by the leaders of States who are charting their foreign policy on a course of aggression, the sooner will a settlement of outstanding international problems—such problems, in particular, as the reduction of armaments and armed forces and the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass



destruction—be achieved, and the sooner will it be possible to take other measures designed to avert the threat of new world war.

100. Mr. KISELYOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR wishes to explain its vote on the item under consideration.

101. I pointed out before, in the First Committee, that the Soviet delegation had submitted to the present session of the General Assembly a concrete programme for strengthening international peace and security, as set out in its draft resolution. It is vitally important to arrive at a timely solution of the grave problems referred to in this draft resolution, in order to reduce the serious international tension and to create an atmosphere of confidence and co-operation among nations and above all among the great Powers.

102. The cessation of hostilities in Korea is an important step towards the reduction of international tension and an important prerequisite for an end to the armaments race. It creates favourable conditions for the drawing up and implementation of measures to avert the threat of a new world war. Our task now is to expose new intrigues on the part of the aggressive forces in the Far East and Asia and to ensure that there will be no sabotage of the political conference on Korea. The Government of the Soviet Union has repeatedly pointed out that the key to the settlement of many existing international problems which ought to be settled lies in the reduction of international tension. This was confirmed in the note of the Soviet Government of 27 November 1953 on a conference of the Foreign Ministers of the four great Powers. The whole world is now interested in this question of a meeting of the Foreign Ministers.

103. The whole world knows of the peace proposals of the Soviet Union on such important international problems as the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction, the reduction of armaments and armed forces, the condemnation of propaganda in favour of a new world war, the peaceful unification of Germany and, lastly, the just solution of the Korean problem. All these proposals have but one end in view, namely, the strengthening of international peace and security.

104. World public opinion warmly welcomes and supports these proposals which, if carried out, would contribute greatly to the strengthening of international peace and security.

105. Unfortunately, the reactionary circles in the United States and some other countries resolutely oppose a timely solution of these important and critical problems of the present day and are on the contrary merely interested in maintaining and even intensifying international tension. These reactionary circles demand the continuation of the cold war and of the armaments race in all the countries of the North Atlantic bloc, and they are resolutely opposed to the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

106. It is known that weapons of mass destruction are becoming increasingly dangerous to many millions of human beings. In order to avert the threat of a new world war and strengthen international peace and security, the Soviet Union proposes that atomic, hydrogen and other types of weapons of mass destruction should be unconditionally prohibited and that the

Security Council should be instructed to take immediate steps to prepare and implement an international agreement which would ensure the establishment of strict international control over the observance of this prohibition. The prohibition of all types of weapons of mass destruction is fundamental to the programme for promoting international peace and security outlined in the Soviet proposal.

107. The ruling circles of the United States, however, have other plans. These circles, having embarked on a policy of force, have decided to prevent the prohibition of atomic weapons by every means at their disposal. All the resources of United States diplomacy have been enlisted to obscure the question of the prohibition of the latest deadly weapons and to classify this proposal, which is beyond controversy, among the issues which are very hard to settle. The advocates of a policy of implacable force and similar methods in the conduct of international affairs do not wish to take into account the changing international situation and the determination of all the peoples of the world further to reduce international tension. The United States, having lost its monopoly in the production of atomic weapons, is nevertheless attempting to retain its dominant position in this field.

108. I think that the General Assembly fully realizes that in the present international situation the question of the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons is of the greatest urgency and importance. World public opinion is becoming more and more emphatic in its demands that these weapons should be prohibited. The General Assembly should meet these legitimate demands and prohibit atomic and hydrogen weapons and also establish a strict international control to ensure observance of this prohibition.

109. The Soviet Union has always attached particular importance to the examination of the question of halting the armaments race and substantially reducing armaments. In order to stop the armaments race, it is necessary in the first place to prevail upon the great Powers which, under the United Nations Charter, bear the main responsibility for ensuring international peace and security, to reduce their own armaments.

110. The armaments race conducted by the countries of the North Atlantic bloc, far from being checked, has been intensified, and the burden of taxation borne by large sections of the populations of these countries is therefore steadily growing heavier. Despite the fact that there is no country that threatens the United States with war, and despite the fact that it is absurd to assert that there is a danger of attack from the USSR and the peoples' democracies, the United States Government is at present maintaining regular armed forces totalling almost 4 million men. In addition to this, the United States has 2 million men in various reserve units and national guard formations. These facts are evidence of aggressive, not defensive, aims, despite the propaganda statements of the ruling circles of the United States to the contrary.

111. In his statement, the representative of the United States, Mr. Lodge, quoted from the Soviet newspaper, *Sovietskaya Byelorussiya*. I would reply to him that this newspaper has always stood for peace throughout the world and will persist in this attitude, which reflects the views of the whole Byelorussian people. We know what war means, and that is why we so firmly oppose all wars and all preparations for such wars. This news-



paper came out against those organs of the American Press which preach hatred among nations and which advocate preparation for a new world war and the intensification of the cold war and international tension. We do not hesitate to say that those who are agitating for such a war are war-mongers, and we shall continue to do so.

112. I now propose to discuss the question of military bases. The delegation of the Soviet Union has proposed that the General Assembly should recommend to the Security Council that it take steps to ensure the elimination of military bases in the territories of other States, considering this a matter of vital importance for the establishment of a stable peace and of international security.

113. We all realize that the establishment of military, air and naval bases in the territories of foreign States intensifies the threat of a new war and undermines the national sovereignty and independence of those States. We have repeatedly pointed out that the United States military bases are established mainly in areas bordering on the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies, that they do not contribute to the defence arrangements of the countries belonging to the North Atlantic bloc, and that they are intended to be used solely for aggressive purposes.

114. How far the establishment of United States military bases in Europe has gone is shown by the recent conclusion of an agreement between the United States and the former associate of Hitlerite Germany, Franco's Spain, which is becoming a military ally of the North Atlantic group and is making Spanish territory available for the setting up of United States military, air and naval bases. In view of these facts it can hardly be asserted that the North Atlantic bloc pursues defensive ends.

115. In an article entitled "United States plans made for Spanish bases" published in *The New York Times* of 10 October 1953, it was reported that "the United States Department of Defense moved today to start work on the construction and improvement of air and naval facilities in Spain". A sum of \$226 million has already been appropriated for the carrying out of the projects and additional appropriations are expected to be sought.

116. Furthermore, systematic and open pressure is being brought to bear on several States in Europe and in the Near and Middle East to compel them to make their territory available for the setting up of American bases, despite the legitimate protests of large sections of the population in these States, which realize that these bases are intended for aggressive purposes and are incompatible with the national sovereignty and independence of their country.

117. The very incomplete information on United States military bases scattered throughout the world shows what a threat these bases constitute to international security; the existence of this network is in-

compatible with the strengthening of international peace and security.

118. Mr. Lodge, in his statement, attempted to distort historical facts and even went so far as to try to justify the seizure of power in Spain by the fascist Franco and the setting up of a fascist régime. This reveals more clearly than anything else the aims of the Spanish-American agreement on military bases: co-operation with Franco's Spain in preparing a new world war. This is how world public opinion interprets this agreement between the United States and Franco's Spain.

119. Common people throughout the world demand that the governments of a number of countries should take decisive steps to put an end to the propaganda conducted in their countries with the object of spreading hatred and enmity among peoples and preparing a new world war.

120. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR associates itself with these legitimate, timely and just demands and supports the proposals of the USSR delegation. These proposals are designed solely to reduce international tension and strengthen peace throughout the world.

121. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union [A/L.168]. We shall vote on it paragraph by paragraph, as such a vote has been asked for.

*The first paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 19 votes to 4, with 28 abstentions.*

*The second paragraph of the preamble was rejected by 29 votes to 7, with 17 abstentions.*

*The third paragraph of the preamble was rejected by 32 votes to 6, with 13 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 1 of the operative part was rejected by 34 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 2 of the operative part was rejected by 39 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions.*

122. The PRESIDENT: We shall vote now on the first part of paragraph 3 of the operative part, ending with the words "independence of States".

*The first part of the paragraph was rejected by 39 votes to 9, with 7 abstentions.*

123. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the second part of paragraph 3, beginning with the words "The General Assembly recommends".

*The second part of the paragraph was rejected by 39 votes to 10, with 6 abstentions.*

124. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on paragraph 4 of the operative part.

*The paragraph was rejected by 39 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions.*

125. The PRESIDENT: The draft resolution was not adopted.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.