

GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

ELEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

Friday, 15 February 1957,  
at 3 p.m.

New York

UN/SA COLLECTION

19 AUG 1957

Page

Agenda item 62:

Question of Algeria (*concluded*)

Report of the First Committee..... 1115

Agenda item 8:

Adoption of the agenda (*continued*)

Sixth report of the General Committee..... 1118

Progress of work of the eleventh session of the General  
Assembly and closing date of the session

Seventh report of the General Committee..... 1141

**President: Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON**  
(Thailand).

## AGENDA ITEM 62

**Question of Algeria (*concluded*)**

## REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/3537)

1. The PRESIDENT: We shall continue with the explanations of vote on the resolution adopted at the 654th meeting with regard to the question of Algeria.

2. Mr. PICCIONI (Italy) (*translated from French*): In accordance with the suggestion made by several delegations, we endeavoured to draft a text to which all the sponsors of the other draft resolutions submitted to the First Committee could agree. The text which we have just approved [A/L.220] is the result of those efforts and I should like to thank the various delegations which helped to draft it.

3. We are pleased that this text was able to gain a unanimous vote in the General Assembly, bringing the discussion of the Algerian question to an end in so satisfactory a manner. This development has been possible because the French delegation made a generous and courageous contribution to the General Assembly's work in offering to negotiate on the Algerian question.

4. I should like to add that the text agreed upon at the 654th meeting is not the result of any bargaining. The heads of delegations who helped to draft it were all prompted by the same desire and inspired by the same principle. Above all, they were moved by a desire that the United Nations should give effect to its words about peace and conciliation and that France should arrive at a peaceful and democratic solution of the Algerian question.

5. I, too, felt that a solution of the Algerian question, to which the French Government, true to the long traditions of the French people, has devoted all its efforts, must, and no doubt will, be a factor of general conciliation among the countries of the Mediterranean area. These nations have a long tradition of friendship and co-operation, and it is only by the sincere and close

understanding for which we all hope that their basic interests can be asserted and protected.

6. Mr. HANIFAH (Indonesia): For more than a week we have been listening to statements on the Algerian question by a number of representatives at the General Assembly, but what essentially concerned my delegation was the possibility that emotion might overwhelm common sense in this matter. However, even during the most heated moments of the debate in the First Committee, we could sense the sincere feelings and great sense of responsibility of the speakers, especially for the fate of the United Nations, and their belief in harmony and good relationships among all Members of the United Nations.

7. We feel happy indeed that, after such intensive deliberation, we were finally able to work out a resolution which was adopted by the General Assembly unanimously. My delegation welcomes this happy outcome.

8. In this regard, however, I should like to make a sincere appeal to France to implement this resolution in the spirit underlying it, that is, with a full understanding of the true wishes of the Algerian people and of the world at large.

9. Indeed, the solution places a heavy burden on the shoulders of France. It is the hope of my delegation that France will do its utmost to solve the Algerian problem along these lines. We look forward to the moment when, before the beginning of the twelfth session of the General Assembly, the situation in Algeria will have so changed that the United Nations will no longer find it necessary to consider the question.

10. We hope that, by then, we will have heard from both sides that the human suffering and loss of life in Algeria have ceased and that a new relationship has been established—a relationship based on true co-operation and mutual friendship, all that being the beginning of a new, free and independent Algeria and a new France, linked to one another by ties of friendship and understanding.

11. Let us hope that, in the shortest possible time, we will be able to announce to the world that France, of its own free will, has again freed another area of the world, thereby fulfilling a substantial task in its world destiny.

12. Mr. DEJANY (Saudi Arabia): My delegation voted for the draft resolution which was adopted unanimously by the General Assembly because, as the President has described it, it was a conciliatory draft.

13. Our decision was naturally influenced by the steady and rapid progress which the question of Algeria has made in the General Assembly and the stage which it had reached in the First Committee. The record of that progress and the stage which it had reached in the First Committee will stand. The Algerian question was discussed quite elaborately in that Committee. The

shadow which was placed around the question of competence vanished, to all intents and purposes, at the end of the discussion in the Committee, in spite of the insistence of some delegations and the qualifications which they made about it. In the end, there was no attempt from any source to challenge the competence of the General Assembly. The competence was definitely established by what transpired in the Committee during the discussion of the Algerian question.

14. We voted for this draft resolution in the spirit of co-operation, compromise and conciliation. We voted for it because we already have on record a vote in the First Committee whereby thirty-six delegations, by voting in favour of the second paragraph of the preamble of the eighteen-Power draft resolution [A/C.1/L.165], recognized the right of the people of Algeria to self-determination according to the principles of the Charter. Only twenty-seven delegations voted against that paragraph. This small negative vote is, for us, the most significant indication of the progress achieved through the General Assembly's discussion of the Algerian question. Recognition of this right of self-determination is, indeed, the crux of the whole problem. Even in the ranks of that small opposition, in many instances it was not a question of denying that right, but a wish to avoid temporarily placing any emphasis on it on grounds of political and special considerations.

15. Equally conducive to our support of the present resolution was the vote in the Committee on the operative part of the eighteen-Power draft resolution. The request to France to respond to the desire of the people of Algeria to exercise their right of self-determination and the invitation to it, and to the people of Algeria, to enter into immediate negotiations with a view to the peaceful settlement of their differences in accordance with the Charter failed of adoption by just one vote. That vote of thirty-three to thirty-four is also a significant indication of the sentiment engendered in the Committee about the Algerian question. The larger margin of positive over negative votes which the three-Power draft resolution [A/C.1/L.166] received over the six-Power draft resolution [A/C.1/L.167], in spite of the priority which was given to the latter, is a further landmark in the endeavours of the United Nations to bring about a just and peaceful solution of the question of Algeria in accordance with the principles of the Charter.

16. We therefore look at the resolution just adopted, not as a substitute for the three draft resolutions voted on in the Committee, but as a furtherance of the progress achieved in the First Committee. We sincerely hope that this impressive unanimity will lead the French Government and the Algerian people to use every possible means to reach agreement on the peaceful settlement of the Algerian question as soon as possible. We trust that this unanimous gesture of goodwill will be met by a similar change of heart on the part of the Government of France, with a view to reaching an early agreement with the Algerian people on the Algerian question, in accordance with the principles of the Charter.

17. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America): By the unanimous adoption of the draft resolution at the previous meeting, the Members of the Assembly have once again demonstrated their capacity for responsible and sober action. The delegation of the United States wishes to express its appreciation and its congratulations to all concerned, whose spirit of co-

operation has made it possible to conclude this item on a positive note.

18. We are also glad to express, once again, our confidence in the ability of France to work out a peaceful, democratic and just solution in Algeria.

19. Mr. KHOURI (Lebanon) (*translated from French*): We should have liked the General Assembly to adopt the draft resolution which the Lebanese delegation had the honour of submitting to the First Committee in conjunction with the African-Asian group [A/C.1/L.165], because we considered it to provide the best means of settling the Algerian question. As that draft was not adopted by the First Committee, the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Japan, Thailand and the Philippines [A/C.1/L.166], which the First Committee adopted, would have satisfied us. In a spirit of conciliation, however, we are willing to make do with the resolution the Assembly has just adopted.

20. In spite of its many shortcomings, we voted in favour of this text [A/L.220] because it includes a number of positive elements which will, we trust, be of value for a peaceful solution of the Algerian problem.

21. In the first place, the fact that the General Assembly has discussed the Algerian question and has adopted a resolution on the subject has given this question an international character. Henceforth the United Nations will not be able to disregard the matter, but will of necessity have to take it up again if France and Algeria fail to reach a peaceful solution of this serious problem within a reasonable time. Secondly, the hope expressed by the General Assembly in the resolution just adopted that, in a spirit of co-operation, a peaceful, democratic and just solution will be found, through appropriate means, in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, inspires us with confidence that France and the representatives of the Algerian people will, through sincere negotiations, succeed in putting an end to the hostilities which are causing bloodshed in Algeria and will find a solution to the Algerian problem which will enable all the peoples of Algeria to exercise their right of self-determination and to move towards independence in free and fruitful co-operation with France.

22. Those are the considerations which induced the Lebanese delegation to vote in favour of the draft resolution adopted by the General Assembly today.

23. Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom): I want briefly to explain the position of my delegation on the resolution which was adopted by the General Assembly at the 654th meeting. We were called upon to cast our vote this morning within a very few minutes after seeing a copy of the draft.

24. As the Assembly is aware, my delegation does not admit the competence of the United Nations to discuss the question of Algeria. Nevertheless, in the First Committee, while reserving our position on competence, we voted in favour of the six-Power draft resolution, which contained no recommendation on this matter, but simply expressed a hope for a peaceful and democratic solution. Since the new compromise draft resolution presented this morning contained some elements which were not present in the six-Power draft resolution, my delegation felt unable to vote for it without very careful consideration. However, after reflection, it seemed to us that we could do so. The resolution, in fact, derogates in no way from the

sovereign rights of France in respect of Algeria; it expresses the hope, which my Government of course shares to the full, that the efforts of France to achieve a settlement will be successful. Moreover, it is, in our view, implicit in this resolution that, in conformity with the principles of the Charter, other Members of the United Nations will do nothing to impede this process.

25. It seems to me a satisfactory outcome of a debate which has helped to bring out the realities of the Algerian problem.

26. Mr. UMAÑA BERNAL (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): The Colombian delegation did not intend to explain the affirmative vote it cast at the previous meeting on the compromise draft resolution which was adopted unanimously by the Assembly. In fact, we feel that compromise texts do not require explanations of votes. They are the result of an agreement which is self-explanatory.

27. Nevertheless, some remarks made at the previous meeting by speakers explaining their votes oblige me to say a few brief words, in order to state very clearly my delegation's position in this debate; for that matter, its position was quite clear and unambiguous in the First Committee.

28. As we indicated by our vote, it was with much pleasure, almost with great enthusiasm, that we welcomed the result that was achieved through the generous efforts of various delegations to reach a unanimous decision in the debate on Algeria; since that decision was a compromise one, we feel that there are neither victors nor vanquished. The decision is outside the scope of the arguments put forward by the French delegation and of the arguments put forward by those who spoke for the Algerian people. As soon as it is agreed to resort to conciliation and to vote in the General Assembly, the parties should, we think, abstain from taking a definite position on the arguments that had been discussed.

29. Since the delegation of Colombia—in accordance with the country's tradition—laid special emphasis on the interpretation of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter concerning competence, I wish to make it clear that, when we voted in favour of the compromise draft resolution, we did not, and we could not, abandon any of our arguments.

30. The resolution which has been adopted does not purport to lay down any doctrine concerning competence or non-competence. That is outside the scope of the resolution, which neither affirms nor rejects the competence of the Assembly; it is therefore a compromise solution. It merely expresses the hope that, through appropriate means, an agreement will be reached.

31. We could very well say that this is one of the most perfect decisions ever reached in the United Nations for the settlement of some difficult problems; it is a decision with neither victors nor vanquished.

32. The United Nations is making provision for a pause, for an intermission during which the French Government should come to an agreement with the people of Algeria, and it should work out a solution which will safeguard what the French Government considers reserved matters and at the same time respect the most noble desire of the Algerian people for self-determination. The resolution speaks of principles, not of competence. It expresses a hope, and competence is not based on a hope.

33. Thus, in these few words—and I repeat, only because of certain allusions that were made in the debate at the previous meeting to delegations which, like mine, propounded so-called absolute arguments in the First Committee—I have felt obliged, on behalf of my delegation, to explain our vote.

34. Mr. CHAMANDI (Yemen): Permit me to explain briefly the vote of my delegation.

35. The delegation of Yemen is one of the seventy-seven delegations which, by voting in favour of the draft resolution, expressed the hope for the settlement of the problem of Algeria through the co-operation of the two parties, the French Government and the Algerian people, in accordance with the principles of justice and the Charter of the United Nations. We voted for that draft resolution because our hopes are high that the French Government will furnish the opportunity for a mutual understanding between France and the Algerian people, and will do its best for the fulfilment of the hopes of the Organization so that the force and the effect of the principles of the United Nations Charter will be apparent, with regard to the Algerian people, by the time of the General Assembly convenes its twelfth session.

36. The delegation of Yemen wishes to thank those American and European delegations which took such a long step in expressing their hopes that the discussions and negotiations would result in the finding of a just solution to this problem by appropriate means and in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. We hope also that all of us will be able to thank the French Government, at the twelfth session of the General Assembly, for the fulfilment of our hopes.

37. Mr. LOUTFI (Egypt) (*translated from French*): I should like to associate myself with the tributes paid to the delegations which sponsored the draft resolution the Assembly has just adopted unanimously and to their conciliatory efforts, which have happily been crowned with success. In a spirit of conciliation, the Egyptian delegation voted in favour of the nine-Power draft resolution [A/L.220]. My delegation is not fully satisfied with this resolution and would have preferred the Assembly to adopt the draft resolution submitted to the First Committee by the African-Asian group; but the resolution adopted is the result of a compromise, and compromises cannot be perfect. We hope, however, that the goodwill we have shown during these debates will be appreciated. It was in that spirit that we supported the nine-Power draft, which has the additional—and to our mind considerable—advantage of having received the unanimous support of the Members of the General Assembly.

38. My delegation has always maintained in the First Committee that, in order to find a satisfactory solution of the Algerian question, which we have discussed at length, it was necessary that negotiations should take place between France and the Algerian nationalists. As I had the honour to state in the First Committee [838th meeting], my Government has done everything possible to encourage contacts between France and the Algerian nationalists, in the constant hope that a solution would be found to this delicate problem in order to put an end to the situation in Algeria which, as the resolution just adopted rightly points out, is causing much suffering and loss of human lives.

39. The operative part of the resolution fosters the hope that negotiations will be conducted between France

and the Algerian nationalists with a view to finding a peaceful, just and democratic solution, in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Thus, it is in a spirit of co-operation that a solution to the Algerian question, the international aspect of which can no longer be denied, should be found, through appropriate means—which surely mean negotiation between France and authorized representatives of the Algerian people—which will take into account the Algerian people's claims and will satisfy both parties.

40. In this connexion, I should like to state that I cannot share the point of view expressed at the previous meeting by the representative of Belgium, who, maintaining that the General Assembly is not competent to deal with the Algerian question, declared that the Assembly had made no recommendation on the question. As you know, we have adopted a resolution, and the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly are and constitute recommendations. I do not wish to enlarge at this point on the question of competence, which has been discussed at great length in the First Committee.

41. At the tenth session, in the same spirit of conciliation, we agreed to postpone the discussion on the Algerian question in the First Committee and in the Assembly. I must say that we were disappointed. We hope that, by this time, the General Assembly's adoption of this resolution will put an end to the policy of force, will help to settle the Algerian question by peaceful means, and will alleviate the serious situation which still prevails in Algeria. We are confident that the voice of the United Nations and of world opinion will be heeded and that peace will be restored in that unhappy country, which is going through cruel experiences.

42. Mr. DE LEQUERICA (Spain) (*translated from Spanish*): The Spanish delegation merely wishes to add its voice to the chorus of satisfaction which, I believe, has been expressed by all the representatives who have come here to explain their votes.

43. This has been primarily a conflict of emotions, involving clashing interests, actualities and also close ties, all of which we must recognize. That is why the Spanish delegation, from the very beginning, expressed its firm desire to co-operate in order to achieve harmony. We could not accept solutions conflicting with our strict interpretation of Article 2 of the Charter. Spain has suffered greatly from tortuous intentions, not so much to apply the Article as to contravene it for the purpose of treating Spain at a given moment in its history as a war threat.

44. At the First Committee's 339th meeting, the representative of Sudan, with great authority and with his usual eloquence, recalled some words uttered against Spain which were contrary to the spirit of the Charter. We, on the other hand, prefer to forget such words, particularly at this moment of harmony in which we are all progressing towards a solution and in which we feel that we have taken a great step in that direction.

45. Therefore my delegation was unable to vote for provisions which violated the Charter—neither for the more radical and violent ones, to which we were openly opposed, nor for milder ones, to which we could not subscribe for the same strong reason. From the very beginning, we found in the six-Power draft resolution [A/C.1/L.167]—which we supported—the basis for efforts to seek a settlement in Algeria.

46. When at one point one delegation attempted to block the three-Power draft resolution [A/C.1/L.166],

we protested, just as we had previously protested against any attempt to curtail the debate. No, the best road to a solution lay precisely in the debate, in the exchange of views, and in the comparison of opinions. To our great satisfaction, our view prevailed in the First Committee, with the consequence that it became possible to combine the two draft resolutions which, from the beginning, as we also said, represented a common spirit. Thanks to that spirit, we have taken this path which, moreover, has avoided the great danger pointed out by the Moslem delegations, with much justice, when the representative of Lebanon told the Committee [843rd meeting] how seriously the Assembly and the debate would be affected if we pitted two worlds against each other—two worlds which ought to understand each other and overcome very great dangers and temptations, and which perhaps seemed opposed, even though they think in practically the same way—merely because of procedural questions.

47. This we opposed. Our ties and our European position, and our Eurafrikan interests, far from obscuring the great Moslem world, make us more responsive to that large mass of human beings, which was so powerful in the historic past and which is now expected to exert a great influence in the forward march of humanity.

48. A collision between those two great parts of the world has been prevented, and we rejoice in that fact; instead, the two parts have been made to converge in a joint purpose, a purpose filled with meaning.

49. The other day I quoted the words of the representative of Cuba who, speaking of the six-Power draft resolution—which is less specific than the one we adopted—said that in his opinion it was a very simple draft but one of extraordinary significance. Indeed, it does have great significance, and it contains an appeal and a warning to both parties to seek, by agreement and the democratic expression of opinion, the solution to a difficult situation.

50. We believe that it is also an excellent agreement for France. The skill with which the French delegation presented in the First Committee [830th and 831st meetings] its plans for consulting the population democratically and for seeking solutions by tranquil and peaceful means strengthens, I believe, its country's position. Without being indiscreet, I may perhaps think aloud and say that this agreement empowers those who have negotiated with the United Nations to present to the French National Assembly the viewpoint of the world; the world did not want to intervene in violation of the Charter, nor did it even want to set up a system of supervision, but it exerted a clear intellectual and emotional influence on the problem of Algeria and invites all those who wish to solve that problem to proceed with magnanimity and prudence.

## AGENDA ITEM 8

### Adoption of the agenda (*continued*)<sup>1</sup>

#### SIXTH REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE (A/3533)

51. The PRESIDENT: In its sixth report [A/3533], the General Committee has reported that there are two requests for the inclusion of additional items in the

<sup>1</sup> By resolution 1119 (XI) of 8 March 1957, the General Assembly decided to adjourn its eleventh session temporarily, and to authorize the President to reconvene it as necessary in order to consider further items 66 or 67.

agenda of the present session. With regard to the first item, it decided, without objection, to recommend the inclusion in the agenda of an item entitled "Agreement on relationship between the United Nations and the International Finance Corporation". The Committee further recommended that this item should be considered in plenary meeting without reference to a Committee. If there are no objections, it will be so decided.

*It was so decided.*

52. The PRESIDENT: With regard to the second request, the General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the item entitled "Question of aggressive acts by the United States of America constituting a threat to peace and security" should not be included in the agenda.

53. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The General Assembly has before it the General Committee's report concerning the Soviet Union delegation's request [A/3530] that the item "Question of aggressive acts by the United States of America constituting a threat to peace and security" should be considered at the current session.

54. The Soviet Union delegation cannot endorse the recommendation made by a majority of the General Committee that the item should not be placed on the agenda of the eleventh session. The General Committee's decision cannot be interpreted as anything but a refusal on the part of some of its members to contribute their share in the fulfilment of a task entrusted to the United Nations, namely, to maintain and strengthen peace. Yet the situation created by the aggressive acts of the United States is fraught with serious danger for world peace and security and requires urgent attention by the United Nations.

55. We deem it necessary to place before the General Assembly the main arguments in support of our request for the immediate consideration of the item submitted by the Soviet delegation. Inasmuch as we are merely discussing the inclusion of the item in the agenda, I shall not touch upon the substance of the problem, except where I have to do so in order to define the Soviet delegation's position.

56. To every unbiased person it is becoming increasingly obvious that the United States Government's present international policy is aimed at a full-scale resumption of the "cold war" and at a worsening of relations with other States. Claims to domination over other sovereign States are being openly advanced, intervention in the domestic affairs of other countries is being intensified, the armaments race is being accelerated even more, the network of military bases is being extended, urgent preparations are being made for an atomic war, there is increasing activity among aggressive military blocs, and bellicose appeals for campaigns and attacks are again being heard, as they were during the worst years of the "cold war". The solution of the disarmament problem and of urgent international disputes is once again being opposed.

57. We do not have to look far for examples. Quite recently the world was brought to the brink of war by the aggression of the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt. Those were days of great anxiety, but the heroic resistance of the Egyptian people, the strong condemnation of aggression by the peoples of the world and the firm and resolute stand taken by the Soviet Union and other peace-loving States compelled the aggressors to terminate hostilities. The United

Kingdom and France withdrew their forces from Egypt.

58. The United Nations played an important part in ending hostilities against Egypt. It might have been expected that, after the end of these hostilities which threatened to lead to a general conflagration, all States, and particularly the great Powers, would learn their lesson and concentrate on a further relaxation of international tension. That is indisputably the desire of the majority of States. There are, however, forces attempting, at whatever cost, to prevent such relaxation and to oppose the restoration of normal relations between States.

59. Anyone who takes the trouble to analyse the events of the previous few months is bound to conclude that these forces are now directed by the present ruling groups of the United States, whose policy reveals their aggressive tendencies ever more openly.

60. Measures are being systematically implemented to aggravate the international situation, to stir up war hysteria and to intensify preparation for an atomic war. In the aggressive plans of the United States, the Middle East is occupying a special place.

61. The so-called Eisenhower doctrine proclaimed in the message by the President of the United States to Congress on 5 January 1957 reflects the desire to pursue a policy of large-scale economic expansion and outright military aggression in the Middle East. It constitutes an attempt to suppress the trend to national independence and to occupy the place of the other colonial Powers—the United Kingdom and France—in that area.

62. The United States Government acts in this matter as the champion of private American monopoly oil interests which are amassing fabulous profits through the exploitation of the Middle Eastern countries' natural wealth. At the same time, the attempt is being made to cloak this colonial policy by the groundless allegation that the independence of the Middle Eastern countries is threatened by the Soviet Union.

63. It is common knowledge that, unlike the United States, the Soviet Union does not possess, and has no intention of acquiring, concessions or bases in this area, or in any other part of the world, but advocates the recognition of the right of these peoples to independent national development and co-operation with other States on the basis of full equality and mutual advantage, subject to no conditions whatever.

64. The Soviet Union has not, and never has had, any special interests in the area, except for its desire to strengthen peace and to prevent the Middle East area, which is situated near its frontiers, from being converted into a centre of dangerous conflicts and provocative acts.

65. The United States is threatening the countries of the Middle East with direct armed intervention in their domestic affairs. It wants to forbid them to develop friendly relations with the Socialist countries, and judging by a statement by Mr. John Foster Dulles, United States Secretary of State, it even wants to forbid them to vote on the side of the Soviet Union in the United Nations.

66. The authors of the doctrine also justify their aggressive plans by declaring that a so-called "vacuum" has been created in the Middle East through the weakening of the position of the British and French colonizers.



67. Yet the peoples of the Arab East repudiate the imperialist theory of the "vacuum" and oppose foreign intervention in their domestic affairs, as may be seen from the statement published at Cairo on 19 January 1957, after the meeting of the heads of the four Arab States of Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia and Jordan.

68. The policy of the United States Government contradicts the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations Charter. It constitutes a serious threat to peace and security in the Middle East and increases international tension. It cannot be argued that the leaders of United States foreign policy do not realize the dangers of the course they have adopted towards the countries of the Middle East. Nevertheless, they regard the policy of gross interference in the domestic affairs of those countries as virtually the only possible course.

69. In this connexion I would refer to a very significant dialogue, which although already cited at the 110th meeting of the General Committee deserves the General Assembly's attention. The dialogue took place in the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives on 9 January 1957. This is what was said:

"Mr. Fountain: Of course, we do not anticipate such, but this authority, if exercised by the President, could possibly lead to World War III, could it not?"

"Secretary Dulles: Yes. It could be World War III."

70. I would also briefly quote statements from Senator William Kerr Scott's statement in the Senate on 9 January 1957 in connexion with the above-mentioned "doctrine":

"... I have tried to get all the information that is available on the matter. I have done this because, after all is said and done, the President's address was an undated declaration of war."

71. If the Middle East is not to become a scene of conflicts and internecine wars, we need, not isolated action by individual Powers by-passing the United Nations and exacerbating the situation, but the joint efforts of the great Powers to consolidate peace, to reduce tension in the Middle East, and thereby to strengthen the sovereignty and independence of the Middle Eastern countries and to develop their economy.

72. The Soviet Government, conscious of all the aspects of the responsibility which rests above all on the great Powers in this matter, deems it essential that these Powers should undertake to be guided by the following principles in their policy towards the Middle Eastern countries:

(1) The maintenance of peace in the Middle East through the settlement of disputes exclusively by peaceful means and the use of negotiation;

(2) Non-interference in the domestic affairs of the Middle Eastern countries; respect for the sovereignty and independence of these countries;

(3) The abandonment of all attempts to induce these countries to join military blocs in which the great Powers participate;

(4) The liquidation of foreign bases and the withdrawal of foreign armies from the territories of the Middle Eastern countries;

(5) Mutual abstention from arms deliveries to countries of the Middle East;

(6) The promotion of the economic development of the Middle Eastern countries unaccompanied by the imposition of any political, military or other conditions

incompatible with the dignity and sovereignty of those countries.

73. This proposal corresponds to the interests of the Middle Eastern peoples. Its adoption would undoubtedly do much to remove tension in this area and to strengthen peace and security.

74. The "Eisenhower doctrine" is one of the manifestations of the "positions of strength" policy, the "brink of war" policy pursued by the United States. This policy is also reflected in the recent intensification of military preparations by the North Atlantic bloc and other military groupings, which are increasingly becoming the obedient tool of United States policy. There is no longer any need to demonstrate the aggressive character of the North Atlantic bloc, the military bloc of colonial Powers in South-East Asia (SEATO) and of the Baghdad Pact; it has been exposed in all its nakedness before the eyes of the whole world by the aggression of the United Kingdom and France against Egypt.

75. The North Atlantic bloc stands revealed as an alliance of the colonial Powers and other Powers dependent upon them which united to defend the colonial system condemned by history and to suppress the national liberation movements. Taking advantage of the weakening of their partners in the North Atlantic bloc and their growing dependence on American deliveries of oil and on dollar credits, the United States forced the recent session of the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] to accept plans for a further intensification of the armaments race.

76. We are all witnessing the spectacle of the United States increasing, instead of reducing, its military expenditure in peacetime without any justification and compelling its Western European partners in the North Atlantic bloc to follow suit. In the course of the last seven years, the NATO countries have spent approximately \$364,000 million on military requirements, and they are now preparing to increase this unproductive expenditure which weighs so heavily upon their peoples. Some partners of the United States are literally groaning under the excessive burden of their military budgets, but as the December session of the North Atlantic Council showed, the United States, in disregard of national interests, is urging those countries to speed up the pace of armament still further.

77. Apparently all "allies" of the United States in the North Atlantic bloc now have to ask Washington's permission before they can reduce their own military expenditure.

78. The role of main striking force of the North Atlantic bloc in the war against the peace-loving States and of chief partner in the United States' aggressive plans is being assigned to West Germany. For this purpose the United States is providing vast material and financial assistance to force the pace of remilitarization in West Germany. It is no coincidence that the North Atlantic bloc has concentrated its efforts on measures for the speedy creation of a West German Army imbued with the spirit of revenge.

79. Not so long ago the ruling groups of the United States and other Western countries were allaying the fears of European nations alarmed at the restoration of German militarism by talking of various guarantees against the possibility of German aggression; but now these guarantees are no longer being mentioned and seem to have been forgotten. Quite recently the existence

of any plans for arming West Germany with weapons of mass destruction was denied, but now that country is being supplied with atomic weapons under the decision of the North Atlantic Council. Thus, the United States is doing everything to resurrect German militarism in flagrant disregard of commitments repeatedly assumed by the Western Powers.

80. It is common knowledge that the young SS men have already been recruited for the army and will constitute its nucleus. Things have gone so far that the Command of the NATO land armies in Europe, including the British and French armies, is being entrusted to a man such as the former Hitlerite General Hans Speidel.

81. It is not difficult to see that this dangerous game is jeopardizing, above all, the security of the peoples of Europe, which have more than once experienced German militarist aggression. We would add that according to *Time* magazine of 29 October 1956 Mr. Walter Strauss, the Minister of Defence, is already asking that the West German Army should be "as independent as possible" and is threatening other peoples with a taste of the strength of reborn German militarism.

82. The aggressive policy of the North Atlantic bloc is leading to a division of Europe and setting the States of one part of the continent against those of the other. That is why the United States and its partners systematically rejected the proposal to establish an effective system of collective security for Europe.

83. The Western Powers' rejection of the Soviet Union's offer to join NATO, which would have turned it into an organization uniting and not dividing Europe, revealed once again the aggressive character of that exclusive military group.

84. The United States' accelerated programme for building new air bases is directly connected with the intensification of its preparations for war. While the Soviet Union, seeking by actions rather than words to strengthen trust among nations, has dismantled all its military bases in the territories of foreign States, the United States has been maintaining more than a hundred air bases and more than twenty naval bases on foreign soil, not counting those bases which are controlled by the United States as the leader of various aggressive military blocs.

85. The United States Press has reported the speed-up in the construction of military bases in Spain. Bases are being constructed on Spanish soil at Rota, Morón, Torrejón, Sanjurjo and Valenzuela. These bases, as was noted at one time by Mr. Harold E. Talbott, the former United States Secretary of the Air Force, are equipped with atomic bombs. It is not even considered necessary any longer to hide the purpose for which these bases are being constructed. The system of military bases, as was cynically noted in the latest report of the Sub-Committee on Disarmament of the United States Senate, makes it possible for the United States to strike at the heart of the Soviet Union. Thus we see that the organ of the United States Congress which chooses to call itself the Sub-Committee on Disarmament is devoting its attention not to the problem of disarmament, but rather to plans for attacking the Soviet Union.

86. Speaking of the significance of a United States military base in another part of the world, namely Okinawa, United States military experts emphasize that long-range bombers based on that island can include within their radius the greater part of Asia.

87. The new United States budget provides for the further expansion and modernization of military bases. Encircling the entire globe, that network of bases is bringing more and more areas within its reach. Commenting on this new budget, the well-known military commentator Hanson Baldwin points out that it constitutes a new step toward committing the nation to a nuclear strategy and reflects a directive of the United States Government proceeding from its intention to make use of atomic and hydrogen weapons in the event of war.

88. At the present time the United States armed forces are being rapidly reorganized to enable them to wage atomic warfare. It has been reported that plans for converting two infantry divisions and one armoured division into atomic divisions are already under way. In addition, under the new United States budget, the number of support commands equipped with atomic weapons is being increased.

89. The United States is not only preparing its own armed forces for atomic war, but is also drawing its various military-bloc allies into its sinister activities. Under pressure from the United States the last session of the North Atlantic Council, as we all know, laid emphasis on equipping the armed forces of that aggressive military bloc with atomic weapons in the future.

90. American atomic war enthusiasts are obviously in a hurry. The North Atlantic Council session had scarcely ended when it was reported in the United States Press that the Defense Department, the State Department and the United States Atomic Energy Commission were already considering changing United States legislation on atomic energy so that there should be no legal obstacles to the delivery of American atomic weapons to the Western European members of the alliance.

91. A special danger to States on whose territory United States military bases are located, and to the cause of peace in general, lies in the United States' plans for setting up and transferring to the territory of other Governments special-purpose American atomic warfare units armed with the latest types of guided missiles intended for atomic bombardment.

92. In a United Press dispatch on these United States plans it was noted that two atomic operational groups were to be stationed in the Middle East during the existing crisis to strengthen the eastern flank of NATO and the Middle Eastern Baghdad Pact. According to other reports, areas where United States atomic operational groups may also be stationed are Western Europe, Turkey, Iran, Japan and the Japanese island of Okinawa. In northern Italy a United States atomic operational group, which is a "model" for the American atomic special-purpose units now being created, is already in action.

93. Anyone can plainly see that the purpose of such activities on the part of United States ruling circles is to divert the major retaliatory blow from the United States in the event that those imperialistic circles should unleash an atomic war, thereby threatening with atomic retaliation the peoples of those States whose territories are being used as a springboard for the preparation of atomic war, that is, the peoples of the United Kingdom, France, West Germany, Italy, Turkey, Iran, Japan and other countries. We may be sure that the peoples of those countries will grasp the true meaning of the aggressive designs of certain circles in the United States which are irresponsibly gambling with the security of nations.

94. In the light of the foregoing facts, which bear witness to the United States' accelerated preparations for atomic war, it is not surprising that, despite the insistent demands of the peoples of the world, there has so far been no progress towards the settlement of the disarmament problem and the prohibition of nuclear weapons. The United States Government is using every possible excuse to avoid taking practical steps to settle the problem of disarmament. It is doing its best to postpone a solution indefinitely.

95. The Soviet Union considers that the foreign policy of the United States is following a dangerous course with regard to questions so decisive for the cause of peace. The development of relations among States should be aimed, not at dividing Governments and preparing for war, but at uniting the efforts of Governments in the interests of peace. That is why the Soviet Union considers it imperative to join forces with other Governments in seeking a solution of the disarmament problem, the prohibition of nuclear weapons and the cessation of the armaments race which imposes such a burden on the peoples of the world.

96. With that purpose in mind, the Government of the Soviet Union, on 17 November 1956, submitted proposals [A/3366] which were entirely practicable and took into account the proposals of the Western Powers. The solution of the problem would change the whole international situation and would eliminate the growing danger of war.

97. Certain influential circles in the United States, however, want to keep the gold flowing from the pockets of the taxpayers into the coffers of the American monopolies which manufacture arms and are putting artificial difficulties in the way of a solution of the disarmament problem. Economic experts in the United States have repeatedly pointed out that that economy is so much directed towards war and that armaments production has become so integral a part of the whole economic system that the slightest prospect of the creation of a less militaristic atmosphere would be enough to make the monopolists quake in their boots.

98. Following an aggressive course in international relations and fostering a "position of strength" policy, the United States is in every way preventing a negotiated settlement of unsolved international problems, greeting with hostility any proposal by the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries aimed at lessening international tension. Even such a constructive step as the proposal for the conclusion of a treaty of friendship and co-operation between the Soviet Union and the United States, suggested by Mr. Bulganin, Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, in a letter to Mr. Eisenhower, President of the United States, on 25 January 1956, failed to elicit a favourable response from the United States.

99. The United States continues to prevent the restoration of the legal rights of China in the United Nations, although without China's co-operation no important international problems can be solved. It is occupying the Chinese island of Taiwan and has made it a centre of plots and provocations against the People's Republic of China.

100. United States policy is designed to maintain tension in the Far East and South-East Asia. The United States repudiated the Geneva Agreement on Viet-Nam of 21 July 1954 and is arming the authorities of South Viet-Nam in the hope of stirring up a new war there. It is hampering settlement of the Korean question and inciting the authorities of South Korea to launch an

armed attack on the North. Such a policy on the part of the United States is an obstacle to the strengthening of peace and the safeguarding of security in Asia and the Far East.

101. We likewise cannot fail to mention such facts as United States intervention in the internal affairs of peace-loving countries. Appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars for subversive activity against the peoples' democracies and the Soviet Union, the United States Government sends spies and diversionists to those countries and disseminates inflammatory propaganda, utilizing for that purpose its whole arsenal of American technical devices: balloons, radio, etc.

102. In that connexion the Soviet delegation wishes to draw attention to the repeated and deliberate violation by United States military aircraft of the frontiers of the Soviet Union. The USSR delegation has distributed in the form of a press release certain official documents relating to those violations, with which the representatives may acquaint themselves.

103. In notes addressed to the United States Government concerning the inadmissible violation by United States military aircraft of the air space of the USSR, the Soviet Government has pointed out that such violations can be viewed only as acts intended to aggravate Soviet-American relations and to bring about a deterioration in the entire international situation. Anyone can see that, if the United States were not pursuing aggressive aims but were attempting to normalize relations between itself and the USSR, there would be no violations of the Soviet Union's air space by United States military aircraft. I might emphasize in this connexion that not a single Soviet aeroplane has ever violated the air space of the United States. This subversive activity, which violates the elementary standards of international law and international relations on the level of government policy, has lately assumed such proportions that it cannot but lead to a serious aggravation of the existing circumstances.

104. The situation which is developing as a result of the increasingly aggressive activities of the United States shows that there is a growing threat to the peoples of the entire world of the outbreak of a new world war, with all the incalculable horrors and sufferings it will bring mankind.

105. All of this imposes a special responsibility upon the United Nations, which in the interests of strengthening universal peace and security and, by virtue of the obligation to the peoples of the entire world laid upon it by the Charter of the United Nations, cannot and must not remain aloof from these events, closely affecting as they do the vital interests of all humanity.

106. The Soviet Union considers that it is not through a "position of strength" policy but through a policy of peaceful coexistence of all countries, regardless of their social system, that peace and international co-operation can be ensured.

107. The interests of peace and security demand that the General Assembly consider without delay the question proposed by the Soviet Government.

108. In view of the foregoing considerations, the Soviet delegation proposes that the General Assembly include in the agenda of its present session the "Question of aggressive acts by the United States of America constituting a threat to peace and security".

109. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America): The General Committee has recommended that the Soviet item accusing the United States of aggres-



sion and aggressive acts should not be included on the agenda. The United States, at the 110th meeting of the General Committee, voted for its inclusion because that is our practice when any charges are specifically directed at us. The General Committee heard the evidence and made its decision, and that decision is a recognition that the Soviet charges have been revealed in their true light as a clumsy and transparent propaganda manoeuvre reminiscent of the worst days of Stalinism. The General Committee made clear its view that the item is not worthy of the time of the General Assembly.

110. I will not impose upon the time of the Assembly to attempt to answer all the wild charges which were made in the General Committee yesterday and were repeated here today, with a few additional ones thrown in. I do feel, however, that in justice to my Government certain answers must be made before the bar of this Assembly. We all realize, of course, that this body is neither a judge nor a jury, but we feel that, when we are attacked in these reckless and extravagant ways, it is our duty to point out a few of the truthful facts.

111. In the Soviet charge, the United States is called an aggressor. Now it is a well-known fact that democracies like the United States are, by the very nature of their systems, forced to accept the first blows in war. Thus, rather than launch sudden and vicious attacks upon others, the United States has been a victim of aggression. Rather than commit aggression, it has come to the aid of other nations who have themselves suffered aggression, including, we might add, the Soviet Union in the Second World War. So this charge of aggression on the part of the United States completely ignores the facts of our history and the facts of our present position.

112. The USSR charges are that the ruling circles in the United States are bringing us to war. Everyone even slightly familiar with the United States knows that there are no ruling circles other than all of the American people who exercise their right in free elections and influence a peaceful United States foreign policy through its elected officials, who are public servants and not masters.

113. We are accused of straining relations between States. This charge comes from the perpetrators of thousands of killings and crimes against the Hungarian people, to say nothing of all the other nations they have enslaved. And in regard to specific charges launched in the General Committee and here, the record of the United States in the United Nations to meet aggression in the Middle East and to improve conditions there is so fresh in our minds as to be clearly known to all.

114. The charges say that the United States, together with other States, should take steps to bring the international situation back to normal now that hostilities have ceased in the Middle East, and then the charges go on to say that that is not what has happened. I leave it to the Assembly. We say that this is exactly what the United States has been doing and is doing today.

115. Now Mr. Kusnetsov has said that the United States is devoting 76 per cent of its budget to defensive purposes. Note that he speaks of our Federal budget only, and national defence is the duty of the Federal Government in our system. He fails to tell you what a small percentage international defence is of our total expenses for government, and he fails to tell you the fact that it is less than 10 per cent of our total national product.

116. Again, the United States is attacked because it has bases in other countries. But Soviet actions have made them necessary. For this reason countries have voluntarily consented, in fact requested, that such arrangements be made.

117. We are accused of unleashing atomic war. This from the USSR which "pushed the button" in the Korean war, causing thousands of soldiers and civilians to die there. The United States is not in the business of unleashing atomic war, or any other kind of war.

118. You have heard it contended today that West Germany is being compulsorily militarized. This is equally unfounded. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization exists because of the aggressive threat of the USSR; it has committed no aggression and could not do so because it is a purely defensive organization and is not allowed to start things of that sort.

119. The Soviet Union makes these charges for what we consider to be quite obvious reasons. First of all, it seeks to break up once and for all the co-operation between the United States and its partners of the Atlantic community. The USSR therefore ascribes devious motives to the United States in the Middle East, particularly that we wish to take over somebody else's influence there. The United States does not take people over, nor does it take territory over. That is a specialty of the USSR.

120. The second purpose of this Soviet attack upon my country is clearly to change the subject, to divert the world's attention and memory from the bloody crimes in Hungary.

121. Finally, and most important of all, the Soviet delegation, by this manoeuvre obviously aims to undermine President Eisenhower's policy with regard to the Middle East. The USSR's request for General Assembly consideration of the item it has proposed is part of the same planned attack against the President's plan for the Middle East, the same attack as that made by Mr. Shepilov, former Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, in a speech before the Supreme Soviet on 12 February 1957. The Soviet note which was handed to the United States, the United Kingdom and France that same day, and the proposed four-Power declaration contained in the note—all these recent Soviet moves are part of a propaganda offensive designed to thwart United States efforts to assist in stabilizing and strengthening the Middle East.

122. This basic purpose of the Soviet Union cannot be camouflaged by the reiteration, in the proposed four-Power declaration, of principles already in the United Nations Charter, such as respect for the sovereignty and independence of other nations, non-interference in their internal affairs and the peaceful settlement of disputes. The United States has consistently adhered to these principles in all its foreign relations, which can hardly be said of the people who make these charges.

123. The Soviets say that President Eisenhower's message to Congress of 5 January 1957 is designed to effect the direct interference of the United States in the domestic affairs of sovereign States in the Near and Middle East. This is the exact opposite of what President Eisenhower's Middle Eastern policy is. His policy is directed against aggression. It is not a policy to fill vacuums left by so-called colonial Powers. We fill no vacuums and we are not colonial. Our policy's aim is to see to it that the countries of the Middle East do not become the victims of the ambitions of an out-

side Power. It is designed to strengthen the countries of this area but—and we note this carefully—only at their request and with their consent. It is therefore a policy which strengthens and supports the United Nations, by strengthening and supporting sovereign countries against the encroachments of those who would take away their sovereignty.

124. There are reasons enough for not allowing further debate on this item: its major premises have been voted on and rejected by the Organization time and time again and as long ago as 1949 and 1951. In addition we are coming to the end of a long session and we have much more serious business than this with which to occupy our time. Moreover, the atmosphere which this Soviet attack would engender, if debated by the Assembly, would have a bad effect on the discussion of constructive proposals.

125. The United States delegation has put forward [A/C.1/783] in this session important new proposals on disarmament, for instance, looking to immediate forward steps in the fields of both nuclear and conventional armaments, and we would not like to have progress on those points jeopardized by such an intemperate attack as we have here, which merely abuses the patience of the Assembly.

126. For all these reasons, the United States will support the recommendation of the General Committee not to include the item in the agenda.

127. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): We have before us the General Committee's recommendation not to include in the agenda of this session of the General Assembly the item proposed by the Soviet Union, "Question of aggressive acts by the United States of America constituting a threat to peace and security".

128. The need for the General Assembly to discuss a question of such importance to the future and to the very existence of all mankind, namely the aggressive activities of the United States in direct preparation for war, can certainly escape no one. Still less should it escape the attention of the delegations here. The General Assembly must have an opportunity to express its views on this item and to take the necessary decisions. It would be unjustified to deprive the delegations of the countries directly threatened of any opportunity or possibility of expressing their fears to the General Assembly of the United Nations, which was created specifically in order to work to safeguard peace and amity among the nations.

129. Moreover, the threat is not only to the countries against which all these preparations and all the campaign of slander and warfare organized by the leading circles in the United States are directed—*pace* the representative of that country—but also to those countries in whose territory the bases and installations referred to in the USSR representative's letter to the President of the General Assembly of 12 February 1957 [A/3530] are established. The whole world is threatened by such a war, which would undoubtedly turn into an atomic war. Even countries which were not dragged in would suffer its effects.

130. Some delegations have objected that it would be difficult at this late stage in our discussions to place such an important item on our already over-burdened agenda. Others—and these the interested parties—have banded together to say that it is a propaganda move directed against the Eisenhower doctrine for the Middle East. The latter certainly feel that this is a

weak spot in the war-like armour of the United States, which is preparing for world conquest, and are afraid that the Assembly may voice criticism and disapproval of the latest United States moves threatening peace and security. Above all, they are afraid that world opinion may be enlightened regarding these aggressive measures which are being paraded before it as peaceful activities.

131. Moreover, it should be noted that it is precisely at the last moment that this new action which seriously endangers world peace and security has been taken. Thus, it was after the beginning of this session and while its work was in progress, after the armed aggression against Egypt, that the action in question was taken, throwing into brilliant relief all the preparations for a vast organization, started long ago with a view to war.

132. Before the aggression against Egypt and the counter-revolutionary *putsch* in the Hungarian People's Republic, there was some slackening of tension in international relations everywhere, owing to the unceasing efforts of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, and the other countries concerned, and there was a trend towards the stabilization of peace all over the world.

133. The impression grew up that the ruling circles in the United States had also begun to adapt themselves to the policy of co-operation inaugurated among the peoples during the last two years. However, the organization of the counter-revolutionary *putsch* against the Hungarian People's Republic, the unprecedented aggression against Egypt, and simultaneously the United States preparations for war such as the Eisenhower doctrine directed towards United States intervention in the internal affairs of the countries of the Middle East and in their mutual relations, designed to bring that part of the world under American domination, the plans for the formation of special United States units armed with atomic weapons to take up stations in countries bordering the peoples' democracies and the frontiers of the Soviet Union, the continuation of the policy of establishing and reinforcing, all round the peoples' democracies and the Soviet Union, military bases which have nothing to do with the defence of the United States and the Western countries—all these activities and other parallel activities have thrown world public opinion into an uproar because they mark a renewal of the armaments race and preparations for war following upon the "cold war". These activities come at a time when the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies have cut down their military forces and at a time when, in the various United Nations committees, efforts are being made for close cultural co-operation among peoples and nations, at a time when peoples throughout the world are preoccupied with the development of trade and economic co-operation.

134. An attempt has been made to present the Eisenhower plan for the domination of the Middle East to us as a measure to promote peace and co-operation and bar the way to Communist infiltration in those countries. But, it is well known that it was not the Communists who committed aggression in the Middle East. It was the friends and allies of the United States who were guilty of that aggression. Moreover, the coolness and apprehension shown by the peoples and Governments of the Middle Eastern countries—with the exception, of course, of certain States allied to the United States and part of their aggressive system—show that they see in it a danger to their national independence.

135. The plan contained in the Eisenhower doctrine for the subjugation of the Middle Eastern countries by American monopolies is coupled with so-called economic assistance, to be given at the discretion of the President. In view of the United States' position during the discussions on the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development, it is clear that American leading circles are not willing to work for the development of those countries without political compensation. This is shown by the fact that the United States is ready to assist certain countries on the express condition that they undertake to follow a policy in line with United States interests and with the aggressive intentions of American imperialist circles.

136. The manifest opposition of the peoples of the Middle East to the Eisenhower plan is certainly motivated also by their fears that, once installed in the area, the United States will use it for the construction of bases for atomic weapons which, in the case of aggression against the Soviet Union, will certainly call forth an immediate and terrible response of which those peoples will become the innocent victims. This plan for the dispersal of all military bases round the socialist countries is also the result of the United States' anxiety to deflect any such reply away from American territory. This is shown by a number of articles in the American Press, *The New York Times* of 15 February 1957 reports that General Thomas D. White, Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, is of the following opinion:

"Because the intercontinental striking force is 'concentrated on a small number of attractive targets . . . it becomes more an invitation to attack than a deterrence to war.'"

137. This is a sure indication that there is no intention of receiving a response on American territory, which would, it appears, become a very exposed target if the aggressive plans of the United States were put into effect. It would obviously be better for any answer to the atomic weapons which the United States is preparing to use to be directed to foreign territory where these bases are, rather than to American territory.

138. The intensive preparations for war being undertaken by the United States are shown in a particularly striking manner in the planning and construction of new American bases in a large number of countries which were already grouped in the American plan of aggression against the USSR and the peoples' democracies, and in other countries which do not yet form part of it.

139. Thus, for example, new bases have been constructed recently or are being planned. On 21 January 1957, an agreement was signed by the Government of Brazil relating to the construction of a military base on the island of Fernando de Noronha. On 25 January, the United Kingdom gave the United States permission to construct a military base on Ascension Island. American bases are being built in Spain, in the Philippines and in other countries. On 5 July 1956, the Chiefs of Staff of NATO published plans for the construction of 250 American bases in Western Europe, most of which are already being built and expected to be completed before the second half of 1958.

140. Other activities are being carried out in the United States under the obvious pressure of the monopolists which are directly concerned and in accordance with the existing trend toward active preparation for an aggressive war. The considerable increase in the military budget just at the time when the Soviet Union is decreasing its military expenditure, the

creation of special units armed with atomic weapons which are to be stationed in various European and Asian countries, the intensive rearmament of West Germany under the constant pressure of the United States military command are new and obvious proofs of this.

141. Quite recently, the American Press reported that, not only would the military bases abroad be manned by American troops trained for atomic warfare, but also military specialists of countries participating in the North Atlantic aggressive bloc would come to the United States to be trained in the use of atomic weapons.

142. These aggressive activities of the United States are creating intense unrest among the peoples of the territories in which American bases are located, despite the statements here that these bases are installed with the consent of the Governments concerned. The consent of these Governments does not change the situation and does not make the American bases less dangerous to world peace and security. The unrest of these peoples is so great that even the American Press has been unable to avoid referring to it. The well-known American commentator Hanson Baldwin, for example, said in articles published in *The New York Times* that the global strategy of the United States and its Allies was being undermined; that was the striking interpretation which certain Pentagon authorities placed on recent events in Iceland, North Africa, Cyprus, Aden, Ceylon, Singapore, New Guinea and Okinawa.

143. All these considerations are an expression of the growing anxiety of the peoples of these territories and of some of their leaders in the face of the danger which ensues from the presence of American bases in their territory.

144. Moreover, in various articles appearing in the American Press, no secret has been made of the fact that these bases are being constructed not for defensive purposes, but for aggression. What other meaning than aggressive intent can there be for such words as: "These bases"—that is, bases in North Africa—"are of enormous importance for the control of the routes leading to the heart of the Soviet Union, by ensuring air bases within range of the heart of the USSR and Europe" (Hanson Baldwin). What would happen, for example, if the Soviet Union did its best to find bases which would control the vital centres of the United States, bases which would be strung along that country's very frontiers, for example, in Mexico or in Canada? In those circumstances, would the representative of the United States not raise in the United Nations the question of a danger directly threatening it? In the face of these facts, which we are merely pointing out, can the United Nations be anything other than anxious or refrain from taking the necessary steps to call upon those responsible to end their aggressive activities? It is unimaginable that this should be so. By acting in that way, the United Nations would be failing in its duty.

145. In the discussion which started at the 110th meeting of the General Committee, an attempt was made to prevent the inclusion of the item proposed by the USSR for the agenda of this session on the same grounds of American good intentions that we have heard today. It is understandable that imperialist circles in the United States should be particularly interested in keeping their intentions quiet and world public opinion unaware of their plans for world domination now under way.

146. If this silence was maintained, it would obviously be much easier for them to put these plans into effect rapidly. In the circumstances, it is natural for the United States representative to express unusual indignation over the revelation of these aggressive plans. It is also quite natural for some of the closest allies of the United States, who hope to win back their laurels through these aggressive plans, to try to turn the discussion away from this subject, as the United Kingdom representative did during the discussion in the General Committee. His indignation over the so-called Soviet propaganda manoeuvre, and his boredom at hearing these facts regarding the aggressive activities of his country's allies repeated by the various delegations of the countries directly threatened are quite understandable. It is of course unpleasing for the representatives of countries which are preparing for war to hear these things, but for the rest, for those who are threatened, it is still more unpleasing to see that these facts exist and threaten the peace of the world. Reference to certain facts, such as, for example, the unheard-of aggression against the Egyptian people, is not sweet music to the ears of certain representatives. We can be sure of that.

147. On this point, it may be useful to point out to the United Kingdom representative that very often we hear certain delegations, even the delegations of great Powers, repeat here in chorus the views expressed by the United States delegation, or sing the praises of the latter's proposals, which are nothing but obstacles placed in the way of disarmament and of world peace and security, and often run contrary to the true interests of their own country and their own people. What is incomprehensible is that the representatives of other countries which can have no aggressive intent, but which would certainly suffer the consequences of a war brought about by the aggressive activities of the United States, should also oppose the inclusion of the item proposed by the Soviet Union on the General Assembly's agenda as they did in the General Committee. We believe that all special considerations should be put to one side when it is a question of defending the peace and security of the whole world.

148. It is also hard to imagine how anyone could try to prevent the discussion of this important item on the pretext that it is too late to deal with it now, since the session is drawing to a close. Too much time has already been spent in dealing with matters which were intended to distract the Assembly's attention from important questions, and now we should decide to work at a much more productive rate, so as to be able to contribute with all our might to the safeguarding of world peace and security. This session has occupied itself with discussions relating to many other questions which were not important, and now some delegations want to ignore the item entitled "Question of aggressive acts by the United States of America constituting a threat to peace and security". We are absolutely sure that the General Assembly cannot fail to take into account all these facts, and we hope that, in accordance with the Purposes and Principles assigned to the Organization by the Charter itself, it will vote in favour of including this item in the agenda of the eleventh session of the General Assembly.

149. Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia): The recommendation by the General Committee not to include the item entitled "Question of aggressive acts by the United States of America constituting a threat to peace and security" in the agenda of the present session of the

General Assembly has forced upon this body the taking of a serious and responsible decision.

150. International public opinion follows, with great alarm, the development of events in this period. It is aware that the events of last autumn, in particular, have brought about a worsening of the situation in the world and the aggravation of international tension. This worsening of the international situation is the result of intensified activity on the part of the imperialistic circles which, led by the United States of America, are hostile to the idea of peaceful coexistence. They have again quite openly resorted to the "positions of strength" policy of stepping up the "cold war". They refuse to accept the solution of controversial international issues by means of negotiations and, instead of this, they insist upon imposing upon the world their own forcible methods of solution.

151. The growing acuteness of the international situation manifested itself, with all its gravity, in the open aggression by the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt, in the extensive and intensified subversive activity of the imperialistic forces which were evident, for example, in the plotting of the counter-revolutionary revolt in Hungary, and, more recently, in the new plans for the colonial domination of the countries of the Near and Middle East.

152. These facts are most alarming. They create new obstacles in the way of a peaceful solution of international problems and endanger every promising step which could contribute to the lessening of tension in the world. This policy of the continuation of the "cold war", the creation of military bases in the territory of other States, the strategy based upon the use of the destructive power of the atomic and hydrogen bombs, all represent a most serious danger to world peace.

153. In such a situation, it is the primary task of the United Nations to discuss in all seriousness and matter-of-factness the causes underlying the deterioration of world peace and to seek all those means by which they can be removed. The fact that the present session of the General Assembly is nearing its closing date cannot constitute a reason for not discussing such a serious question. It is specifically during the past few weeks that facts have piled up which testify to the aggressive actions which are endangering international peace and security. The Czechoslovak delegation is of the opinion that, before the end of this session, the General Assembly should take measures to improve the relations between States and thus contribute to the consolidation of peace. The request submitted by the USSR [A/3530] undoubtedly deserves the greatest attention of the General Assembly.

154. The people of Czechoslovakia, like other peace-loving peoples all over the world, follow with serious anxiety the activation of the imperialistic forces, which endangers peace and security in the world and creates new hotbeds of the threat of war.

155. Czechoslovakia, as an immediate neighbour of Germany, cannot overlook the fact that the ruling circles of the United States, supported by other Western Powers, are regenerating the military potential of West Germany, encouraging revengeful efforts and preparing the revived *Wehrmacht* to become the main striking force in the fight against the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist camp.

156. In the territory of West Germany, there is an extensive network of United States military bases where American atomic weapons are being stored.



Moreover, steps are being taken to enable West Germany to produce weapons of mass destruction by itself. The power of the old Hitlerite army is being revived; the ill-renowned General Staff, on which the former Nazi generals are now becoming eligible to serve, is being re-established. The renewed *Wehrmacht* is to become the backbone of the forces of the aggressive North Atlantic Alliance on the European continent. The public opinion of the world has received with unconcealed aversion and indignation the news that the command of the NATO ground forces in Europe has been entrusted to the Hitlerite General Speidel.

157. We still have in mind the important role played by the heavy industry and the armaments industry in the Ruhr in bringing fascism to power in Germany and in unleashing the Hitlerite aggression. Those industries financed the Nazi party and brought it to power; they armed the Hitlerite army and instigated the Second World War, the aim of which was to rob and enslave the European nations. These industries, so important for the rearmament of West Germany, are regenerated with abundant American assistance. Today, as before the Second World War, the West German economy is in the hands of 300 monopolists who actively assisted Hitler in the realization of his objectives.

158. The remilitarization of West Germany, carried out by the ruling circles of the United States, constitutes a serious menace to the peace and security of the world. The European nations are ever more aware of the fact that they may again fall victim to the German expansion and urgently demand that an end be put to this policy threatening humanity with destruction and devastation.

159. It is only natural that the Czechoslovak people are following the remilitarization of West Germany with the utmost attention and apprehension. The present development in West Germany, reminding us menacingly of the situation before the Second World War, cannot be passively condoned by nations which felt the bitter consequences of German aggressive militarism on their own flesh. Czechoslovakia, one of the first victims of the Hitlerite aggression, has the moral right, and also, we believe, the moral duty, to caution the world not to permit the repetition of the bitter experiences of the past.

160. We have been witnessing lately ever-extending aggressive military measures within the North Atlantic bloc and other aggressive alignments led by the United States. For years we have been witnessing a stepped-up armaments race in the countries of the North Atlantic bloc, which represents the main aggressive alignment directed against the socialist countries and is at present overtly used also for the preservation and restoration of the colonial system. The fact that during the seven years of the existence of NATO its members have appropriated more than \$364,000 million for the armaments race certainly does not testify to its peaceful or defensive nature.

161. Near the Czechoslovak frontier, in the military bases of West Germany, as well as on the territory of quite a number of other States, special American units armed with atomic weapons are being stationed. By these measures of the United States, the threat of atomic war would be brought to the territory of other States. Of the same alarming character is the news proving that the network of American military bases on the territory of foreign States continues to be expanded and the existing military bases further improved and modernized.

162. The military planning of the United States is being speedily put into effect, especially in the recent period. This planning is based on the so-called global American strategy and the concept of atomic war. The American aggressive circles refuse to accept the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction. Their military planning is dependent on these arms and is based on their large utilization. In 1954, the Chairman of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Arthur W. Radford, declared that atomic weapons had already gained the position of conventional weapons in the United States armed forces and that atomic weapons had to be used simply as a new form of explosive.

163. I would like to confine myself to some examples from the last few days. On 10 February 1957, for example, news was published on the progress of work on the construction of the so-called key post in the world-wide network of bases in foreign territories, namely, the base of Rota on the coast of Andalusia in Spain. This base is being equipped with a mechanism which will enable the operation of the heaviest atomic bombers, and 3,000 United States soldiers will be quartered there by 1959. The range and scope of the construction of military bases prepared for the atomic bombardment of the socialist countries is proved by the fact that in Spain alone the United States Strategic Air Command has four additional bases under construction.

164. On the same day, another statement was published, this time from the opposite side of the globe—Brazil. A base for the control of inter-continental guided missiles is under construction there, together with other military bases for securing military communications with Europe and the Middle East.

165. The danger resulting from the construction and extension of United States military bases on the territory of foreign States is further increased by new preparations by the United States for atomic war from these bases. At the beginning of this year, plans were published for stationing American forces equipped with atomic weapons at American military bases abroad. Concrete plans already exist for stationing units equipped with atomic weapons in West Europe, Turkey, Iran and Japan. There can be no doubt that these steps by the Government of the United States increase the danger of atomic war.

166. The strategy of the United States Government, which is based on the use of atomic weapons against the countries of the socialist system, finds expression also in new measures within the framework of the aggressive alignments, such as NATO, the South-East Asia Treaty Organization [*SEATO*] and the Baghdad Pact; NATO has adopted measures to include atomic weapons in the equipment of its units. How far the United States has gone in its preparations for atomic war is shown by the interview given by the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, General Lauris Norstad, to the *U. S. News & World Report* of 30 November 1956, in which he declared that there is no possibility of drawing a line between atomic and non-atomic units; no specific military detachments are equipped exclusively with conventional armaments; all units are being adapted to the conduct of an atomic war.

167. The United States Government is maintaining constant tension and the menace of an armed conflict also in the Far East. Even after the failure of their military adventure in Korea, the United States did not give up its aggressive aims against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the neighbouring



countries, above all against the People's Republic of China. This is proved not only by the continued frustration of a peaceful settlement in Korea and in Viet-Nam, but also by the maintenance and expansion of a whole chain of military bases in this area. News is reaching us of the construction of a new large base on the island of Taiwan and on the extension of the bases on Okinawa.

168. The situation in the Near and Middle East has become especially acute. Instead of contributing—after the treacherous attack of the United Kingdom, France and Israel—to the normalization of the situation in this area, the United States Government proclaimed, at the beginning of this year, plans which constitute a programme for direct interference into the internal affairs of sovereign States in this part of the world: a programme of economic and political enslavement of the nations of the Near and Middle East. American monopolistic circles, making use of the weakened positions of the United Kingdom and France, are endeavouring to impose their domination over this part of the world and to divest a number of countries—Members of the United Nations—of their independence.

169. The so-called Eisenhower doctrine proclaimed by the President of the United States on 5 January 1957, creates a new danger to the peace and security not only of this area, but of the whole world. Under this doctrine, the United States Government intends to build a broad network of military bases in the Near and Middle East. The American Press refers also, in this connexion, to the stationing of special atomic units in these bases, which allegedly have to strengthen the defence of this area against the menace of the so-called "Communist danger".

170. To enable this plan to be realized, all States within this area are to be politically and economically subjugated. For this reason, the Eisenhower doctrine is accompanied by a programme of so-called economic assistance. The programme of this economic assistance recalls the aid under the ill-famed Marshall Plan for Western Europe, which proved to be a system of gross interference and economic control incompatible with the independent economic development of countries, leading ultimately to their complete economic and political domination.

171. From the point of view of the United Nations Charter, the Eisenhower doctrine constitutes a gross violation of the fundamental principles upon which this Organization was founded and upon which it is based. The plans incorporated in this doctrine by-pass the United Nations. The responsibility for peace and security in this area is being placed in the hands of the United States, whereas the Charter entrusts such responsibility exclusively to the Security Council.

172. The Eisenhower doctrine is also contrary to Articles 52 and 53 of the Charter, on regional self-defence. It aims at the subordination of States within this area to the exclusive influence of the United States—which is thousands of miles away from this area. The Eisenhower doctrine is incompatible with the principles of peaceful coexistence and friendly co-operation of States, which are the main pillars of the United Nations.

173. In order to divert the attention of the people of the world from the American plans for a new colonial subjugation of the Arab nations in the Near and Middle East, the Eisenhower doctrine proclaims that American assistance is to protect the States of this area against

the bogey of communism. This is not the first time American aggressive circles have used such a pretext in order to disguise their expansionist aims. The bogey of "communism" is being employed by the politicians in Washington arbitrarily, and they endow the term "Communist aggression" with whatever meaning they choose to serve their own purposes. In this connexion it is necessary to recall that in concluding the aggressive Manila pact—SEATO—the United States made a reservation to the effect that the concept of aggression referred to in the treaty was to be "Communist aggression" only.

174. The tactics of the imperialistic circles to divert attention from their own aggressive plans by means of the bogey of "Communist danger" are but too well known. However, it is grotesque indeed that the United States has resorted to these tactics with regard to the situation in the Near East. Here no fabrications can deceive anyone as to where the true danger of aggression arises. Here we have to do with the aggression of the allies of the United States, their chief partners in the NATO bloc; an aggression which was so branded and condemned both by the United Nations and by international public opinion. No one could succeed in mistaking the British-French-Israel aggressors for someone else. The aggression against Egypt is not yet liquidated; the troops of the aggressors are still on Egyptian territory. In this situation, the assertion of the United States that the Arab nations are under a threat of aggression by the socialist countries is really the perfection of slander, the purpose of which is to divert attention from the reality. It is well known that it was precisely the socialist countries which proved true friends of the Arab nations in the time of trial.

175. The Eisenhower doctrine represents another epoch in the history of the long struggle of American monopolies for world domination. At the same time, it is a dangerous programme, which complicates the international situation and opens new possibilities for the preparation of a world war.

176. The enunciation of this doctrine for the Near and Middle East—which also envisages the use of the armed forces of the United States in this area—has met with disapproval not only by the international public, but also by the American public itself. This danger has been the object of warnings, also, by leading politicians in the United States. Thus, for instance, in referring to this plan Senator Estes Kefauver declared on 6 January 1957: "If adopted, it could lead to World War III".

177. There is no doubt that the efforts of the ruling circles in the United States to create in the Near and Middle East area another focus of increased international tension represent a serious threat to the peace.

178. The aggressive plans of the United States Government are reflected in the budget for the year 1957-58. Figures released testify to the fact that the United States Government is further stepping up the armaments race and continuing its policy "from positions of strength"—a policy of threats and extortion. Direct appropriations for armaments are being increased, compared with the previous year, by \$2,000 million and constitute 63 per cent of all expenditures under the budget. The increase of military expenditure is being justified by the contention that "the military strength of the United States is the bulwark of international peace and freedom". What can these words mean but another confirmation of the policy of "posi-

tions of strength"—a policy of interference and an effort to dominate the world.

179. The Czechoslovak delegation fully shares the apprehensions which have been expressed here as to the consequences entailed by the aggressive actions of the United States. The attitude of the United States, as reflected in these actions, is not based upon the endeavour to achieve mutual co-operation in the interest of the maintenance of peace, but on a policy which opposes States to one another—which inevitably leads to an aggravation of international tension and to the increased menace of a new war.

180. Every day we become more convinced that the fight for the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security is the most serious task which we are all facing at the present time. Therefore the United Nations must do everything possible in order to assist in the accomplishment of this aim. In the light of the intensified aggressive measures of the United States of America, especially in the recent period, it is of the utmost importance that the General Assembly devote its attention to these questions, with all the urgency they deserve.

181. Therefore the Czechoslovak delegation cannot agree with the recommendation of the General Committee [A/3533] and fully supports the request of the USSR [A/3530] that the "Question of aggressive acts by the United States of America constituting a threat to peace and security" should be included in the agenda of the eleventh session of the General Assembly, and considered without delay.

182. Mr. NASE (Albania) (*translated from French*): The delegation of the People's Republic of Albania deeply regrets that the General Committee has not recommended the inclusion in the agenda of the eleventh session of the General Assembly of the item proposed by the Soviet Union delegation: "Question of aggressive acts by the United States of America constituting a threat to peace and security".

183. The aggravation of the present international situation through the aggressive policy of the United States is causing serious concern to the peace-loving peoples of the whole world and creating an urgent problem which is of primary importance and should be considered without delay by the United Nations.

184. Our Organization cannot underestimate the gravity of the present international situation. It should devote its whole attention to the matter. The principles and purposes of our Organization make this imperative. It is the duty of the United Nations to make a true assessment of the situation, to determine who is responsible for the present international tension and to seek to remedy it.

185. Following the numerous defeats suffered by imperialism in Asia and Africa in this period in which the colonial system is disintegrating, influential circles in the United States are persisting at all costs in their policy of world hegemony and are doing their utmost to poison international relations, to renew and to push forward their policy of "cold war" and war psychosis, intensify the armaments race and to prepare by every means at their disposal for a third world war.

186. The unprecedented armaments race, the formation of a system of aggressive blocs, the intensification of military measures of aggression within these blocs, the creation of a network of United States bases near the frontiers of the socialist countries, the recent establishment on the territory of other States of large

American tactical units equipped with atomic weapons, the subversive activity and espionage directed against the socialist countries, together with other similar measures, all these constitute an essential part of the "positions of strength" policy of the United States.

187. The United States is not alone in pursuing this belligerent policy of preparation for a world conflagration. It has partners, such as the United Kingdom, France and other Western countries which belong to these aggressive blocs. It is the United States, however, which is at the head of all these blocs and is bent on retaining that role.

188. United States post-war foreign policy, which is becoming more aggressive every day, is aimed basically at two objectives: the isolation and violent overthrow of the socialist countries and world domination by American imperialism.

189. Although the ruling circles of the United States prefer to camouflage this policy of world hegemony, President Eisenhower's message of 10 January 1957 constitutes an eloquent admission in this respect: "Our pledged word, our enlightened self-interest, our character as a nation commit us to a high role in world affairs, a role of vigorous leadership."

190. It is not by chance that such a clarification of United States foreign policy was included in this Presidential message concerning the United States programme for the Near and Middle East. The famous Eisenhower-Dulles doctrine is only a manifestation, for one specific region, of the general policy of world domination followed by American monopolists.

191. The United States programme for the Near and Middle East simply reveals the intention of continuing one and the same policy: a new capitalist apportionment of the world by bringing former British and French possessions and zones of influence under United States domination, a policy undertaken after the Second World War.

192. The Eisenhower doctrine, which, to achieve these objectives, goes so far as to provide for the use of United States armed forces, is merely another form of colonial expansion and is part of the aggressive United States plans against the Soviet Union and the people's democracies. The President's message of 10 January makes no secret of this, since it speaks of the strategic and economic importance of the region: "The Middle East provides a gateway between Eurasia and Africa. This contains about two-thirds of the presently known oil deposits of the world." Thus, although the President's message refers to "the menace of international communism" and to the "Soviet peril", the authors of the plan themselves admit that it is really concerned with subjugating the countries of the Middle East in order to gain possession of sources of raw materials, communications and strategic points. Everyone knows that the States of the Near and Middle East are not in any way threatened by the Soviet Union or by any other of the socialist countries.

193. We should also bear in mind that, according to this doctrine, United States assistance will be granted only to States "which have Governments manifestly dedicated to the preservation of independence and resistance to subversion". This leaves no doubt about its true intentions. It is brutal interference in the domestic affairs of the countries of the Middle East, it is a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter, which by the very terms of Article 2, paragraph 7, prohibits

intervention in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of States.

194. World public opinion, including the peace-loving peoples of the Arab countries, resolutely denounces this so-called doctrine of an aggressive policy of imperialist domination. Evidence of this is found in the Egyptian political weekly *Rose el Youssef*, among others, which states:

"The new Eisenhower plan does not hold an olive branch to the world. On the contrary, this plan aims at establishing American domination over the Middle East with the aid of dollars and armaments. It is contrary to the United Nations Charter and constitutes a threat to the independence of the States in this region. The Eisenhower plan is inspired by the old American policy 'speak softly and carry a big stick', which has long since failed."

195. According to the French newspaper *Combat*, a "great relieving operation" is taking place in the Near East and the United States is trying to "fill the gap left by the total disappearance of the influence of London and Paris in countries where it had been implanted for centuries".

196. In the United Kingdom, Mr. Zilliacus, M.P., stated amongst other things in his letter of 17 January 1951 to the *Manchester Guardian*:

"All this is merely back to the cold war, trying all over again the British and French policies which have lamentably failed in the Middle East and in which the Americans have failed in the Far East and all of us in Europe."

197. Even public opinion in the United States has denounced the Eisenhower doctrine. Senator Kefauver, stressing the aggressive character of this doctrine, said on 6 January 1957 that it was "loaded with dynamite" and that he was unwilling to support it.

198. Hence, public opinion in the United States and throughout the world has realized the colonialist character of the Eisenhower doctrine and the grave consequences it holds out for the sovereign peoples of the Middle East and for the cause of world peace.

199. The Eisenhower doctrine, a doctrine of aggression, violation of the Charter and international inequality, is merely a new episode in the disintegration of the colonial system. It is a doctrine based on calumny and camouflage. The sovereign States of the Middle East are fully aware of this and will not be taken in.

200. I have ventured to speak at length on this important question because Albania is a Mediterranean country, and my Government is particularly concerned about this aggressive plan of the United States in the Near and Middle East, an area neighbouring on south-eastern Europe, of which my country is a part.

201. In implementing their aggressive plans for the domination of peoples, the United States is relying heavily on military pacts such as NATO and SEATO. The foreign policy makers in the United States, while speaking of the development of the "non-military aspects" of NATO, are making ever greater efforts to extend its military activities. They are revising their Atlantic strategy, which is becoming more and more adapted to the conditions of a nuclear war in which the main role will fall upon new weapons and particularly nuclear weapons.

202. The United States generals who are in command in NATO are taking all kinds of steps to extend

still further the network of military bases. General Cortlandt Van Rensselaer Schuyler, Chief of Staff of the Supreme Headquarters, Allied Powers, Europe [SHAPE], stated that NATO will have 250 aerodromes in all.

203. The countries which are members of NATO are organizing a number of military exercises, including some with atomic weapons. Important manoeuvres were conducted at the end of September 1956 in all the Allied territories in Europe, from Norway to Turkey. One of their special features was the deployment of tactical aerial forces of the United States, which took off from American aerodromes en route for bases in France, Northern Italy and West Germany. First priority has now been accorded to the plan for assigning large special American units equipped with atomic weapons to the territories of other States.

204. In its aggressive plans, the United States of America is devoting particular attention to the accelerated remilitarization of West Germany by creating a large army equipped with the most modern weapons and commanded by Hitlerian generals and officers. The point has been reached where Hitlerian generals, in the service of the armed forces of NATO, are commanding not only the armies of West Germany but also those of the United Kingdom and France. According to an announcement by the Ministry of Defence of West Germany, in the last few months alone 13,000 ex-officers of the Hitlerian SS have responded to the Ministry's appeal to enlist in the NATO army. Is not this a very dangerous course which seriously threatens peace in Europe and in the world?

205. The West Germans, who thirst for revenge, forgetting the lessons of recent history, have already begun hysterically to demonstrate their aggressive intentions. The United States is mainly responsible for this situation.

206. The Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies have constantly sought to find a real solution to the problem of disarmament: the practical measures adopted in the socialist countries for the reduction of armed forces and armaments and for cuts in military budgets bear witness to this. The United States has not only raised a series of artificial obstacles in the way of the solution of this problem but has steadily increased its military budget, which this year has attained a level unprecedented in time of peace. Today the United States is spending more on armaments than it spent during the years of the last war.

207. Interference in the domestic affairs of the socialist countries and subversive activities are another feature of United States foreign policy. The United States has proclaimed the so-called "policy of liberation" directed against the socialist countries. For several years this policy has formed the basis of United States relations with the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies. The United States has spent more than \$600 million in recent years on financing subversive activities in the socialist countries.

208. The Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the other peoples' democracies, including my own country, have always followed a policy based on the principles of coexistence and international co-operation. The Soviet Union has made a series of proposals with a view to adopting concrete measures for a negotiated solution of outstanding international problems. The basic principle of the foreign policy of the socialist countries is the maintenance and con-

solidation of peace, peaceful coexistence and friendly co-operation between nations on the basis of sovereign equality and mutual interest.

209. Inspired by this principle, the Government of the People's Republic of Albania has developed a policy of peace and good neighbourliness and has spared no efforts in contributing to the best of its ability to the common cause of peace and friendship between peoples.

210. We have always considered it our duty to speak the truth about the danger for world peace represented by the aggressive policy of the ruling circles of the United States of America. Certain delegations find it easy to accuse us of making propaganda when we demonstrate the truth of the facts which prove the aggressive policy of the American imperialist circles. We are used to these accusations and they will not prevent our speaking and repeating the truth as long as that is necessary.

211. Taking into account the facts set forth above, my delegation feels it essential that the item proposed by the Soviet Union delegation should be included in the agenda of the present session in order that the General Assembly may examine it and do its best to prevent the United States of America from continuing its aggressive policy, so as to forestall further United States activities which aggravate the international situation and prepare the way for a war that will be the most terrible that mankind has ever known.

212. In these circumstances the responsibility of the United Nations assumes particular importance for the maintenance of international peace and security in conformity with the great aims laid down in the preamble of the Charter, "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind".

213. We hope that the General Assembly will not follow the recommendation of the General Committee, which will be fraught with grave consequences for the very future of mankind and will jeopardize the prestige and authority of the United Nations.

214. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The Government of the Soviet Union has deemed it its duty to draw the attention of all Members of the United Nations to the aggressive acts of the United States of America constituting a threat to peace and security.

215. Its request for the inclusion of this item [A/3530] was made after a thorough analysis and prolonged study of the international situation. Unfortunately, the General Committee rejected the Soviet Union's request by a majority vote and recommended that the Assembly not include the item "Question of aggressive acts of the United States of America constituting a threat to peace and security" in the agenda of the eleventh session of the United Nations General Assembly. The members of the General Committee who voted against the inclusion of this item explained their vote by asserting that the Soviet Union was guided by considerations of "propaganda" in submitting its request.

216. Mr. Wadsworth, the United States representative who has just spoken, also attempted to show that the Soviet Union had raised the issue for propaganda purposes. Every time the Soviet Union lays issues affecting the peace and security of all peoples before the United Nations, we hear the hackneyed and well-worn

allegation that the move is prompted by propaganda motives.

217. The word "propaganda" cannot cover up the facts, which prove that the United States of America is making preparations for atomic war on an unprecedented scale, that it has been and is establishing air bases and atomic stockpiles for this purpose in all parts of the world. The United States land, sea and air forces are being trained for offensive operations entailing the use of atomic weapons. New and ever more destructive types of bombs are being developed and stockpiled, and the production of all types of weapons of mass destruction is being expanded.

218. United States ruling circles not only refuse to agree to the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, but have begun to implement a plan for the formation of special United States military units armed with atomic weapons and for their deployment in the territory of other States. Prominent United States politicians and military leaders make no secret of their plans for the unrestricted use of atomic and hydrogen weapons. Propaganda is being carried out with the aim of world domination, which is linked with a trend towards expansion and aggression.

219. The representatives of Western European, Asian and African countries who are present at this meeting should give serious thought to this situation and should not remain silent. They should ponder the fact that the United States' new plans for the unleashing of a war—an atomic war—are designed to deflect the main retaliatory blow from the United States and thus to place the peoples of those countries in which it is proposed to station United States military units equipped with atomic weapons under the serious threat of such retaliation. This is the truth.

220. The United States Government has adopted a policy calculated to exacerbate the situation in the Near and Middle East even further. The recently proclaimed Eisenhower doctrine reflects nothing else but the aggressive designs of United States ruling circles. Its purpose is intervention in the domestic affairs of the countries of the Near and Middle East without so much as a "by your leave".

221. Most countries throughout the world are indisputably seeking a relaxation of international tension and an end to the "cold-war" policy. Yet United States ruling groups are pursuing a policy intended to exacerbate the international situation, to intensify the "cold-war", to impair relations between certain States, thus further heightening the danger of a new war.

222. The development of international relations is now at an extremely important and crucial stage. We are all very well aware that the peoples long for peace and profoundly hate war. It is our duty to promote the settlement of controversial international problems and to further the peaceful solution of all international disputes on the basis of respect for the sovereign rights of all peoples. At the same time, we must not shut our eyes to the fact that, side by side with the peace-loving forces, there are other forces at work in the world, which are bent on war and aggression. It must be frankly stated that the reactionary forces of the United States of America are pursuing a "cold-war" policy and are seeking to settle international problems "from positions of strength".

223. Like other peace-loving peoples, the Byelorussian people have a vital interest in preventing a further exacerbation of the international situation. Having



suffered invasion by the Nazi armies, the Byelorussian people does not wish to see humanity again drawn into the maelstrom of a new world war. Ordinary men and women all over the world are impatiently awaiting the easing of international tension and the removal of the threat of a new world war.

224. We regret that fundamental international problems have so far not been appropriately settled in the United Nations. The Organization has repeatedly engaged in fruitless discussion of questions totally unrelated to the maintenance and preservation of peace. The provisions of the Charter designed for the defence and consolidation of peace and security throughout the world have not been fulfilled.

225. We have witnessed the spectacle of the United States delegation in the United Nations using an automatic majority to defeat a number of most important proposals intended to strengthen the cause of peace, and even trying to use the United Nations flag as a cloak for its destructive war of aggression against the peaceful population of Korea.

226. The United Nations has been unable to solve such grave questions as disarmament, the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction, and a number of other important problems.

227. The United States Government's policy of "positions of strength", the resulting drift to war, the armaments race, the ensuing militarization of the economy and the artificial curtailment of advantageous trade relations between East and West have placed certain States, particularly in Western Europe, in a serious position. It is not surprising that even in the NATO countries the popular movement for a change in the policy of the Governments concerned for bringing that policy into line with national interests is gaining much ground. The peoples are withholding their confidence from Governments which seek to continue the irresponsible policy of exacerbating the international situation. The people of the Western countries, which have been dragged into the "cold war", are weary of high taxes and of the continual anxiety for the morrow.

228. The peace-loving peoples of all countries are asking for the peaceful settlement of unresolved controversial issues by negotiations between States and particularly between the great Powers. In this connexion, it should be pointed out that United States ruling circles frequently use the word "negotiation" to mask their true aims. Their proposals for "negotiations" are qualified by conditions clearly designed to make the projected negotiations virtually impossible. In the course of negotiations, conditions are frequently stipulated which nullify the results of the negotiations. That policy may be illustrated by their attitude in regard to the negotiations on the reunification of Germany.

229. It is common knowledge that the existing international tension is due to the aggressive designs of the ruling circles of the United States and certain other countries. In his statement here, however, Mr. Wadsworth, the United States representative, tried to whitewash and justify United States foreign policy before the forum of world opinion and to blacken Soviet foreign policy, which is one of peace and friendship between nations.

230. The agitation for a new world war which is taking place in a number of countries constitutes a serious threat to peace and to the peaceful settlement of international problems. Essential features of this

agitation are war hysteria and malicious slander of the Soviet Union and the democratic camp, which does not stop short of open appeals for the overthrow of the present Governments of those countries. On 6 January 1956, the White House released a statement emphasizing that the "liberation" of the populations of the peoples' democracies "has been, is and until success is achieved will continue to be the major goal of the United States foreign policy". Some countries, among which the United States of America occupies the first place, are blatantly disregarding General Assembly resolution 110 (II) of 3 November 1947 condemning all forms of propaganda which is either designed or likely to provoke or encourage any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression.

231. Prominent political and military leaders of the United States, the United Kingdom and other countries are indulging in statements designed to whip up war hysteria still further. Blackmail connected with atomic and hydrogen bombs has received particularly extensive publicity. The pages of United States newspapers and periodicals frequently contain warlike pronouncements by generals calling for an armaments race and fostering a war psychosis. Thus, on 3 February 1956, the periodical *U.S. News & World Report* published an interview with General Maxwell D. Taylor, the United States Army Chief of Staff. I would cite the following passages from the General's answers:

"We are arming ourselves with atomic weapons as well as conventional ones . . . we can visualize the tremendous morale effect of atomic weapons going off in enemy territory and we need to have our troops quickly there in order to intensify that effect, take over and never allow the enemy to recover."

Taylor's answers make it clear that 200 foreign divisions are being trained by United States officers in sixty countries, most of which are situated, as he puts it, around "the communist bloc".

232. As reported by a United Press correspondent from Washington on 17 January 1957, Admiral Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, stated in Congress that the United States already had armed forces which could, if necessary, fight in the Middle East and that the United States already had obligations compelling it to fight in certain contingencies. In Korea, Radford said, the United States was ready to fight at five minutes' notice.

233. Nor can we omit mention of the latest militarist pronouncement made by British Field Marshal Bernard Law-Montgomery, Deputy Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, on 10 December 1956 in a lecture entitled "The Panorama of War and the Nuclear Age" given at the Royal Military Institute. Montgomery called for an anti-Communist crusade. The British Field Marshal was so carried away by the idea of an atomic war that he even indulged in fantasies, sketching a picture for his listeners of how in 1966—in ten years' time—the "West" would sweep the "East" off the face of the earth in the course of thirty to sixty days of destructive atomic war. Montgomery tried to frighten his listeners with the prospect of a new world war. He called on the Western Powers to exert themselves to the utmost to supply their armies with atomic weapons.

234. I should like to quote the reply of a commentator in the British newspaper *Daily Mirror* who, in referring to Field Marshal Montgomery's "lecture", condemned his cynical statements, imbued as they were



with the spirit of war propaganda. "I wonder", writes that commentator, "what we would say if Marshal Zhukov got up in public and gave a detailed account of how Russia intends to destroy and annihilate us in the course of ten years, indicating that no mercy either would or could be shown to the survivors."

235. These are the facts showing that there are forces preparing irresponsible plans for a new war. The threatening references to atomic and hydrogen bombs and the fanning of war hysteria are evidence of the existence of warmongers in the Western countries who cannot renounce their fantastic plans to bring about a change in the political system of the peoples' democracies by the use of force. They are prepared to stoop to any means to achieve their objective; they disseminate dangerous theories, for instance, that peace can be maintained by means of increased atomic power and the continuation of the armaments race.

236. Reactionary groups are thwarting by every means in their power a solution of the most important international problems by negotiation. Peace and friendship between nations do not correspond to the interests of monopoly groups and hamper the realization of colonialist plans.

237. As far back as 1952 one of the militarist United States generals, former United States Air Force Chief of Staff Hoyt Vandenberg, publicly urged his colleagues to look at things only from a long-term standpoint through the "long gun-barrel of history". What an expression! Vandenberg's suggestion was taken up and carried into effect by the leaders of NATO. In season and out of season, they intimidate the peoples of the West with the spectre of a new world war.

238. These circles draw their ideas and inspiration from Mr. John Foster Dulles, who, speaking on 9 June 1956 at Iowa State College, showed that he was still advocating the old, bankrupt "position of strength" policy. In the attempt to justify the colossal expenditure on the armaments race, which annually absorbs thousands of millions of dollars, Dulles in his speech advanced the view that that expenditure represented the price of peace, and that the armaments race policy was a sort of "peace insurance policy". It is clear from the arguments Dulles used that by "peace insurance policy" he means the construction of United States military bases all over the world, the stockpiling of nuclear weapons, the maintaining and arming of the forces of Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee. By "peace insurance policy" Dulles means intervention in the affairs of the countries of the Near and Middle East, because that area "produces the oil required for the industry of Western Europe and for the military establishment of NATO". "Within the last ten years", says Dulles, "the United States has made treaties with forty-two countries of America, Europe and Asia. These treaties abolish, as between the parties, the principle of neutrality." An "obsolete conception", an "immoral, short-sighted conception"—that is the way United States Secretary of State Dulles describes the independent policy being followed by the Governments of many nations which do not wish to bow their necks to the yoke that aggressive blocs seek to impose upon them.

239. Thus, the unrestrained armaments race and the destruction of the independence of sovereign States are described by Dulles as a "peace insurance policy" and it is for this that he is calling upon the American people to provide colossal sums of money.

240. The facts show that the aggressive imperialist forces have notably intensified their activities in recent years. These forces, headed by the United States of America, are trying by every means in their power to aggravate the international situation, to drag humanity into a new war and to bring down upon the nations of the world the horrors and calamities of such a conflict. The policy of reviving German militarism, which is being carried out by the ruling circles of the United States, is fraught with special danger for the peoples of Europe and of the whole world. Yesterday's aggressors who enslaved the peoples of Europe are today being armed once more so that they can repeat their perilous adventures.

241. Twelve years after the end of one of the grimmest and bloodiest of wars in the history of mankind, German imperialism again appears on the European and international scene, brandishing weapons, threatening the peace and security of nations.

242. Ruling circles in the United States, taking cover behind fine phrases about "peace" and "defence against aggression" and posing as "peace-makers", are giving special attention to the militarization of West Germany. They are hastily setting up West German divisions with a view, later, to throwing them into a future battle against the peace-loving nations of Europe. Modern armaments, including atomic and hydrogen weapons, are being placed in the hands of former Nazi generals, such as Speidel, who has already been mentioned here. We shall never forget that the Nazi generals were the murderers of millions of women and children, that they destroyed Minsk and Warsaw, Stalingrad and Coventry, that they were the executioners of Oswiecim, Maidanek and Lidice.

243. Everyone can see that a neo-Nazi *Wehrmacht*, soon to number about 500,000 men, is being established. Those forces will be equipped with the most modern armaments, including atomic, chemical and bacterial weapons. In West Germany today the construction of barracks, military stores, firing grounds and airfields is being feverishly stepped up. West Germany is being equipped with United States weapons and supplies. The militarization of West Germany's industry is proceeding apace.

244. The statements of a number of West German officials show us clearly what they are dreaming of. Let me cite a few examples. According to the newspaper *Le Monde* for 15 March 1952, Walter Hallstein, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the Bonn Government, said during his visit to the United States that the ultimate goal of the West German revanchists was the creation of a free and united Europe extending to the Urals. That shows how far they are aiming. The former President of the Bonn Parliament, Adolf Ehlers, said that "the conquest of the East and the south-east should be the goal of all Germans". Other similar statements could be quoted.

245. The fact is that in the West an aggressive North Atlantic bloc has been established which includes militaristic West Germany. The armed forces of that bloc are fully and actively engaged in preparations for an atomic war of aggression against the USSR and the peoples' democracies.

246. The peace-loving peoples must be vigilant and must take measures to protect and safeguard their peaceful work and their security. The message sent in February 1957 by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Nikolai Aleksandrovich Bul-

ganin, to the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, Konrad Adenauer, was an important contribution to the strengthening of peace and security in Europe and throughout the world. In that message Bulganin said that "the basic interests of both the Soviet and the German people called for a decisive departure from mutual suspicion, not to say hostility in the relations between the USSR and the Federal Republic of Germany, and a move towards trust and friendship. The necessary opportunities for such a shift exist and are far from exhausted".

247. The Byelorussian people welcome and approve this message from N. A. Bulganin, which is designed to secure a further normalization of relations between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. The normalization of relations between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany would serve the common interests of both the German and Soviet people and would at the same time promote a general relaxation of international tension.

248. The experience of history and the lessons of the past half-century have shown us that, when the German and Soviet peoples have marched together in the cause of peace, Europe's security has been strengthened. An entirely different situation was created in Europe when normal relations between the peoples of Germany and the Soviet Union did not exist. Hostile relations between the peoples of both countries and the wars they waged against each other in the past benefited only those Governments which want others to pull their chestnuts out of the fire.

249. Today, reactionary circles in the United States and other countries are hatching plans which would enable them to warm their hands in the blazing holocaust of a new war and to turn bloodshed and destruction to the profit of their own monopolies. A new war would inevitably convert the territory of Germany into a battlefield and a scene of atomic devastation.

250. In their speeches, the political and military leaders of the United States do not hesitate to appeal for the continuation and intensification of subversive and diversionary terrorist activities against the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies.

251. The United States Press and radio publicize various plans for the utilization of military bases for attacks on the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the peoples' democracies. It is openly stated in the Press that United States air bases are intended for the destruction of the Soviet Union's economic centres and that from those bases lightning atomic attacks could be mounted against any major industrial target in the Soviet Union.

252. Thus, the former United States Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Robert Bostwick Carney, in a speech made in New York, called for a preventive war with the Soviet bloc and declared that the United must "measure its strength with Russia now". (Those were his words.) The irresponsible nature of this propaganda and of all this cheap United States advertising of aggressive plans is obvious to anyone who has any common sense.

253. All these bellicose statements by the blatant propagandists of a new world war are by no means accidental. The lessening of international tension which had recently become evident proved unpalatable to the United States monopolists, who see in the establishment of normal international relations a threat to their

profits. Such propaganda arouses the just indignation of public opinion throughout the world.

254. Our duty is to promote the settlement of controversial international issues. We must try to put the United Nations back on the path which was laid down for it in the Charter and to further the peaceful solution of international conflicts on the basis of respect for the sovereign rights of all peoples. The peoples of the entire world expect from the United Nations effective and constructive measures for the strengthening of international peace and security.

255. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR firmly supports the Soviet Union delegation's request [A/3530] to place on the agenda of the eleventh session of the United Nations General Assembly the "Question of aggressive acts by the United States of America constituting a threat to peace and security", and calls upon the General Assembly to support that request.

256. A discussion of this question at the present session would help to eliminate the threat of a new world war and to reduce tension in international relations.

*Mr. Noble (United Kingdom), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

257. Mr. JOJA (Romania) (*translated from French*): The present session of the General Assembly opened at a critical juncture in the international situation, at a time when the process of relaxation in relations between States, which had begun to develop after the 1955 Geneva Conference of the Heads of Government of the four great Powers, was interrupted. Because of the aggressive actions of certain Western circles against the liberation movement of the colonial peoples and the independence of peoples recently liberated, and because of United States propaganda against the socialist countries, there has been a considerable deterioration in international relations. This turn in the international situation cannot fail to be of deep concern to peoples attached to peace. For these reasons, world public opinion welcomed the positive part played by the United Nations in halting aggression against Egypt, and it expected that the General Assembly, at its eleventh session, would make an ample contribution toward enabling mankind to return to the ways of co-operation and understanding. It has been in this spirit that the Romanian delegation, from the very beginning of the session, has joined its efforts with those of all other delegations endeavouring to devise a course of positive action which the General Assembly might follow in the solution of major international problems.

258. However, these constructive efforts have run foul of the tendency, initiated mainly by the United States delegation, to turn the United Nations into a forum for making propaganda, for sowing distrust between States and for waging the "cold war", and also into an instrument of political policy serving the interests of certain influential circles in the United States.

259. This trend within the United Nations goes hand in hand with actions outside the Organization which are seriously undermining the principles of the Charter and are threatening the peace and security of the peoples of the world. The Romanian delegation would like to call particular attention to the grave consequences for international relations of the steps taken by the United States during recent months to intensify

its atomic weapons programme. It is not our intention to deal again with the many and incontestable facts cited by the representatives who have preceded me to this rostrum and who have offered convincing evidence that the United States has embarked upon such a dangerous and risk-laden course. What strikes us as being particularly serious is the fact that all the measures resorted to reflect a military and strategic concept which has taken definite form and has become a predominant factor in the foreign policy and entire strategy of the United States.

260. The organizing of United States land, naval and air forces on a basis of atomic weapons and the various statements made by American officials indicate that the United States would use its atomic weapons in the event of local armed conflict. The steps taken to provide atomic weapons for United States bases on foreign territory, the decision imposed on the North Atlantic Council at Paris by the United States that the armed forces of NATO should use atomic weapons, and the equipping of the new *Wehrmacht* with atomic weapons—all this, far from representing isolated or haphazard measures, is evidence that the United States has clearly undertaken a programme of preparation for atomic war. All these measures and concrete acts have been accompanied by a systematic propaganda campaign designed to instil the idea that atomic war is an inevitability in the present age and thus to destroy the will of the people to fight against this frightening prospect. It is no accident that the memorandum on disarmament presented to the First Committee by the United States [A/C.1/783] does not mention the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, even as a distant goal. Similarly, it is no coincidence that the United States delegation to the United Nations has manoeuvred to set aside the draft resolution concerning the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests [A/C.1/L.160].

261. The atomic age decidedly does not mean atomic war. The atomic age means the utilization of nuclear energy for the common welfare and for the progress of science and civilization. We cannot agree that the trend to atomic war is inevitable. It is within our power to halt this trend and to prohibit atomic weapons in order to safeguard mankind from the actions of certain irresponsible elements.

262. The problem facing our Organization is a problem of the greatest importance to humanity, for the question is whether the United Nations can remain indifferent to an intensification of the atomic weapons race or the adoption by the United States of measures likely to heighten the danger of atomic war.

263. The noble purposes—and in particular the defence of world peace and security—for which the United Nations was established and the humanitarian principles on which the Organization was based are incompatible with the barbarous idea of using atomic weapons and with the destruction which an atomic war would bring upon mankind and upon the civilization that has been built up over a period of thousands of years. The United Nations is in duty bound to oppose the fateful turn being given to events by the recent action of certain aggressive groups in the United States, which is tending to bring on an atomic war.

264. The intensification of preparations for atomic war is accompanied by an increase in the general military expenditures of the United States.

265. The recent actions of the United States in the Near and Middle East are especially dangerous. The

Eisenhower doctrine, embodying as it does the United States policy in that region, seriously undermines the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and gravely impairs its effectiveness. Instead of co-operating in efforts to buttress the independence of the States in this area and to improve economic conditions there, the United States is putting pressure on them with a view to setting up new military bases on their territory and involving them in its aggressive policies.

266. The Romanian delegation believes that it is the duty of the United Nations to consider the recent intensification of United States efforts to surround the socialist countries with a network of military, air and naval bases which are obviously aggressive in character. Romania, along with the other peoples' democracies, feels fully justified in calling on the United Nations to take steps to put a stop to these acts which are contrary to the interests of international peace and security. Even some of the military leaders of the United States are aware of the legitimate fears which are being felt throughout the world because of these military actions. General Nathan F. Twining, Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, stated on 30 January 1956 before the Sub-committee on the Air Force of the Senate Committee on Armed Services that he often had the feeling that he would be unhappy to see the United States surrounded by 300 or 400 Soviet bases in Canada and Mexico, for that would be rather a bad situation for the United States.

267. On the same occasion, Mr. Donald A. Quarles, Secretary of the United States Air Force, said that for him it was a source of comfort to know that no potential enemy had a similar system of bases around the United States.

268. In the light of modern technological developments, it is difficult to know to what extent Mr. Quarles' sense of comfort may be justified. In any event, countries other than the United States also have a right to this sense of comfort, or rather, sense of security. The United States military leaders, who obviously know the purposes for which the military bases have been established, no longer find it necessary to waste time in talk about the "defensive" nature of these bases and admit that the States concerned have legitimate reason for disquiet. In these circumstances the nations involved have all the more right to raise their voices in protest and to ask that such obviously aggressive acts should be stopped.

269. United States military bases situated thousands of miles from the territory of the United States represent a serious danger to international peace and security which the United Nations can no longer ignore.

270. The Romanian delegation believes that an inquiry by the General Assembly into the recent aggressive acts of the United States will shed light on some of the underlying causes which have prevented the United Nations from carrying out its function of improving the international situation.

271. The Romanian delegation believes that if the United Nations is to perform its function as provided in the Charter, it must keep a careful check on the development of dangerous trends in international relations, analyse the causes involved and intervene in time to prevent such trends from evolving into aggressive acts. It is exactly such a problem which is now facing the United Nations, because the recent aggressive acts of the United States obviously represent a most serious danger to international peace and security.

272. For these reasons, the Romanian delegation is in favour of including this additional item in the agenda of the eleventh session of the General Assembly.

273. Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland): For several months the Polish people have been watching with anxiety the developments on the international scene. We have all been attaching great hopes to the relaxation of international tension which was so clearly marked in the course of the last few years and was highlighted in 1955 at the Geneva Conference of the Heads of Governments of the four great Powers.

274. We all know how great is the influence of the great Powers in matters of war and peace. That is why we have welcomed, with a feeling of relief, the strengthening of co-operation and understanding among them. The more we are disturbed today by the recurrence of the atmosphere of suspicion and tension, the more we regret some manifestations of big-Power politics, which in our opinion are incompatible with the interests of humanity and of peaceful co-operation among nations.

275. We consider it advisable and useful that the United Nations should enter upon discussions of those political moves which can give rise to international tension. That is why we consider unjust, on principle, the negative decision of the General Committee as to the inclusion in our agenda of the item proposed by the Soviet Union. This question is so vital and so important for the world that, if there is anxiety on the part of several Governments as well as of world public opinion, discussion should not be avoided.

276. There are serious doubts as to the possible consequences of the policy of the United States in recent times. In the first place I have in mind, of course, the plan for the Middle East. It is sufficient to follow the discussion of this subject in order to see how great is the opposition to it, how serious is the criticism of its substance and of its possible repercussions in the world at large. It is the considered view of the Polish delegation that the very concept of "a political vacuum" has ceased to exist. Any attempt to act from without—any attempt to intervene in the affairs of sovereign States—is in our view likely to have detrimental effects. What is even more important, the countries of the Middle East themselves want to shape their own destinies. Small wonder, therefore, that attempts at foreign interference have provoked resentment and strong feelings among these people.

277. The declaration of the Arab States stressed that "they resolved never to allow their countries to become spheres of influence of any foreign Power".

278. In this connexion, I should like to recall the words of Mr. Nehru, Prime Minister of India—they were very convincing words:

"If there is a power vacuum in West Asia, it has to be filled by countries in that region through their internal strength and unity. When a foreign Power tries to step into another country, it disturbs the peace of that country and creates conflicts; it gives rise to tension and a race among foreign Powers."

279. These few examples suffice to arrive at the conclusion that there are serious and well-founded fears and misgivings concerning the danger to world security and the increase of international tension caused by the United States plan for the Middle East. There are serious reasons for suspecting that we have here an effort to arrest the process towards independence of the countries of Asia and Africa, a process which we have witnessed during recent years. It is worth recalling

that, on 31 October 1956, President Eisenhower said, with regard to the Middle East:

"This ancient crossroads of the world was, as we all know, an area long subject to colonial rule. This rule ended after World War II . . ."

We agree with this analysis. We do not think, however, that the so-called plan for the Middle East provides a logical sequence to it.

280. We are engaged now in a procedural discussion, and for that reason I think it is sufficient to say that the problem exists, and that—to use a legal term—a *prima facie* case can be established. Therefore, the item proposed by the Soviet Union should be thoroughly discussed here, with the attention it deserves.

281. However, the problem of the Middle East is not the only reason for which we consider that this discussion is advisable. For us Poles there exists another, more direct threat; I have in mind the German problem. We are deeply disturbed by the rearmament of West Germany precisely at a time when we in the United Nations are concentrating all our efforts towards reaching an agreement on effective disarmament. Atomic weapons are to find their way into the armoury of a State in which revisionist circles, bent on revenge, utter threats against Poland and refuse to recognize our western frontier, thereby constituting a danger to the integrity of our territory and to the independence of Poland. We are deeply worried by recent reports that, in the course of the next year, West Germany will have seven fully equipped divisions, the hard core of which will be no other than former SS officers.

282. We are deeply disturbed by the continuation of the policy of military blocs, by the armaments race and by the continuing division of Europe into opposing camps. We look with serious misgiving at the existence of military bases in foreign territory. I doubt if anyone in this hall can question the deep anxiety with which we are watching these events; for no other nation has such tragic memories, no other people has suffered such tragic losses, as the people of Poland.

283. It is for that reason that we think that these important questions concerning the peace of Europe and of the world call for discussion. Let us consider how we can prevent further aggravation of the situation in Europe, how we can break this chain of ominous events, how we can stop the building of military installations and military bases, the setting up of strategic frontiers which separate peoples instead of linking them together, which drive them apart instead of bringing them together. We should bear in mind the fact that the division of Germany and the maintenance of the division of Europe is contrary to the vital interests of that continent.

284. We must try to build a bridge between the countries members of NATO and those members of the Warsaw Pact, and seek ways to bring about the setting up of the European security system. There is no better forum than this for the discussion of these problems. By avoiding discussion, we shall not escape the problem itself. A debate in the United Nations would be fruitful, because it would allow us to get at the root of the evil, to establish its causes and thereby help to find ways and means for improving the situation.

285. We of Poland, so vitally interested in the international *détente*, are of the opinion that we should do all in our power to remove all obstacles on the road towards international co-operation and understanding. That is why we are in favour of the discussion of these



problems, and that is why we are in favour of a discussion of the item proposed by the Soviet Union.

*Prince Wan Waithayakon resumed the Chair.*

286. Mr. STRATOS (Greece) (*translated from French*): The Greek delegation has always upheld the principle that all questions raised should be included in the agenda and considered by the General Assembly. However, the application of this principle in an absolute manner—and during the last days of the Assembly's work—involves the risk of preventing the consideration of items that are already on the agenda.

287. The agenda of the present session has been extremely heavy. As yet, it has not been possible to discuss several very important items which have been on the agenda since the very beginning of this session. To cite only one example that is of particular interest to my delegation, the question of Cyprus, which has become a grave international question, has been awaiting its turn for three years. The time for discussion has come, but it is being postponed from day to day. This question, and others which are perhaps just as important and as serious, must now be fitted into the one remaining week of work. How can these questions be discussed with the thoroughness demanded by their gravity?

288. Accordingly, even though we are in favour of including in the Assembly's agenda all the items that are proposed, we cannot agree to the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the present session. We shall vote in favour of the General Committee's recommendation [A/3533].

289. Mr. MAKSIMOVICH (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The Ukrainian delegation attaches great importance to the question which has been raised by the Soviet Union, the question of aggressive acts by the United States of America constituting a threat to peace and security.

290. It is the General Assembly's fundamental duty to maintain international peace and security and to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights. To accomplish these aims, the United Nations should seek ways and means of uniting the efforts of all States, and should find a way to reduce tension and to eliminate from relations among States actions which endanger peaceful development and increase the threat of a new war.

291. As is known, such actions include the warlike plans of the United States of America in regard to the Near and Middle East; the policy, openly embarked on, of using atomic weapons, and the practical steps taken to prepare for such warfare; the activation of the military blocs organized by the United States; the establishment of special formations for subversive operations in other countries; resistance to the solution of such international problems as disarmament and the German, Korean, Vietnamese and other questions; the organization of openly *putsch*-like activities; and other actions of the United States which aggravate the situation and endanger peace and security.

292. Mr. Wadsworth, the United States representative, asserted today that the Soviet delegation's action in raising the question of aggressive acts by the United States represented an attempt by the Soviet Union to prevent the realization of the so-called Eisenhower doctrine; and, of course, he asserted that the goals of that doctrine are purely peaceful. But such statements will convince no one. Is it not a fact that the Eisenhower-Dulles programme for the Near and

Middle East is a programme of war for oil, a programme for converting the countries of this region into a base for aggression against the peoples which have recently flung off colonial bondage?

293. To illustrate the view held among large sections of the public in the United States, let me quote an editorial from the newspaper *High Point Enterprise* which is published in North Carolina. This editorial was considered important enough by Senator Samuel J. Ervin Jr. to have it printed in the appendix to the *Congressional Record* of 9 January 1957, on page A86. It expressed the view that the plan proposed by the President gave the impression of being "a dangerously inflammatory policy, promising very little good while placing the country in highly vulnerable exposure". The *High Point Enterprise* goes on to put a question which is bound to occur to many Americans: "Would we be justified now in enunciating a doctrine for the area . . . which neither the peoples nor the governments ask for and which we have reason to believe they would resent?" Nothing could be plainer than that.

294. Let us take one more example. Admiral Radford, addressing the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the United States House of Representatives, emphasized that one of the main objectives of United States policy was to make available strategic positions and transit rights in the Near and Middle Eastern countries. The type of transit this United States admiral is concerned with is obvious,

295. The aims of the United States of America are poles apart from the interests of the peoples of this region and are not concerned with the strengthening of their economy or the safeguarding of their independence. What is spoken of is the strategic position of the United States of America, but it is clear to all that the objective concealed behind these words is to convert the area in question into a support point, a base for the preparation of atomic war against the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries.

296. However, United States policy with regard to the countries of the Near and Middle East is not inspired only by the desire to use them in the narrow military strategic interests of United States military leaders. This region possesses vast natural wealth which, if used in the interests of the people of these countries, could ensure their economic and cultural advancement, give them a high level of living, and enable them to develop mutually advantageous trade with all countries. The monopolies of the United States, however, have different plans for the oil wealth which belongs to these peoples. They see in the weakened position of the United Kingdom and France in this region, especially since their aggression against Egypt, a favourable opportunity for the seizure of these oil resources. Even today, the United States monopolies control almost 60 per cent of the oil production in these countries. But the appetite grows with eating. The United States oil monopoly Aramco [Arabian American Oil Company] draws fabulous profits from the exploitation of the oil wealth of Saudi Arabia. The slogan "What is good for Aramco is good for the United States" was obviously one of the decisive factors in the formulation of the United States programme for the Near East.

297. It is plain that the conduct of this policy in the interests of the super-profits of the United States monopolies cannot serve the interests of the peoples of



the Arab countries, the interests of the American people itself, or those of the peoples of other countries.

298. A few words more about the Eisenhower doctrine. The realization of this doctrine will lead straight to the unleashing of war by the ruling circles of the United States at such time as they think fit. Indeed, the Eisenhower doctrine will leave the United States Government free to decide unilaterally what acts constitute aggression and what do not. It is not for nothing that for many years the United States has stubbornly resisted the very idea of the United Nations adopting any kind of definition of aggression, and has, to all intents and purposes, diverted this project into a blind alley. What is more, the United States Government, under the Eisenhower doctrine, may take military action against any country of this region—and not only of this region. For as Mr. Dulles explained to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the mere fact of any country voting with the USSR in the United Nations will justify including that country among those controlled by international communism and, consequently, among those on which the muzzle of the Eisenhower doctrine will be trained. Furthermore, the United States Government will be able, whenever it so desires, to use armed force against any country if it considers that its interests—or, to be accurate, the interests of monopolies like Aramco—are threatened.

299. In this connexion special emphasis must be placed on the fact that such use of United States armed forces under the Eisenhower doctrine may mean unleashing atomic war. Mr. Eisenhower, the President of the United States, made that quite clear at his press conference of 23 January. In reply to the question whether tactical atomic weapons would be used if the Eisenhower doctrine was applied, the President stated: "... you would almost have to use them, the way our forces are organized in that area".

300. The Eisenhower doctrine is additional proof that the United States policy has entered a phase in which the ruling United States groups are widening the boundaries of the area in which they intend to use armed force, including atomic weapons, in the selfish interests of the monopolies and against the will and vital interests of the peoples.

301. Yet it must be recognized that a solution of all the problems of the Near and Middle East in the interests of the peoples of the region, in the interests of strengthening peace and security, is fully possible. The recent Soviet proposals were framed with those aims in view.

302. If peace and tranquillity in this region are to be ensured, the United States, the United Kingdom, France and the USSR must undertake not to interfere in the domestic affairs of the peoples of the Near and Middle Eastern countries and to act in a manner consistent with the preservation of peace in this region.

303. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR fully supports the request by the Soviet Union [A/3530], which opens the way to the peaceful solution of the problems of the Near and Middle East.

304. The United States representative attempted to deny the dangers inherent in the policy of establishing military bases, in particular, atomic weapons bases in the territory of the countries bordering on the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies.

305. In the Ukrainian delegation's opinion, a bare denial of this kind can in no way conceal the seriousness

of the situation resulting from the intensified preparations for atomic war which are being made by the ruling circles of the United States. How can United States representatives talk of the peaceful nature of such acts when the real situation is one of the encirclement of peace-loving countries by large numbers of military, air and naval bases, which have instructions to intensify the preparations for an attack on the countries in question?

306. When we consider, furthermore, that this is being done to the accompaniment of statements by United States officials that the United States must use atomic weapons even in the event of a minor conflict, the seriousness of the situation which has arisen will become plain to all.

307. Now, we may ask, would the United States react if other States constructed a chain of military bases near the United States, equipped those bases with atomic and hydrogen weapons and prepared for an attack on the United States? Obviously the United States of America would consider such a development a serious threat to itself, to peace and to security. Why, then, does the United States Government demand that other States should take a different attitude to its own acts?

308. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR considers that such acts by the ruling circles of the United States can be regarded only as a manifestation of the notorious "brink-of-war" policy—and the brink is being gradually eroded by the efforts of the United States aggressors. We support the request for consideration of the question of aggressive acts by the United States because we see the dangerous consequences of these acts for the whole world.

309. One of the dangerous adventures which the United States is endeavouring to carry through in the Far East, and which represents a serious threat to peace, is its aggressive and provocative policy towards the People's Republic of China. The United States of America still continues to cling to the Chiang Kai-shek clique and to engage in subversive activities against the People's Republic of China.

310. After the six hundred million people of China had overthrown the hated Chiang Kai-shek clique, ejected the United States colonizers who had been lording it in their home, and founded a great Power—the People's Republic of China—the United States of America seized the Chinese island of Taiwan, concentrated its naval and air forces there, assembled and transported to the island the pitiful remnants of the Chiang Kai-shek clique, and converted the island of Taiwan, which belongs to the People's Republic of China, into a military base where it is kindling the fires of war against the People's Republic of China and other Asian countries.

311. From Taiwan, military air raids are carried out against peace-loving Chinese towns, gangs of diversionist spies and assassins are sent into the People's Republic of China, and piratical raids are carried out against the shipping lanes linking China with the rest of the world.

312. According to an Associated Press report of 22 December 1956, the Chiang Kai-shek general in command of the military air force admitted in an interview with the A.P. correspondent that in 1956 more than 3,500 air sorties were made from the island of Taiwan against the territory of the People's Republic of China.

313. United States Senator Albert Gore, who recently spent five weeks in the Far East and also visited the

island of Taiwan, confessed that he had been amazed at the adventurist activity in which American military personnel were feverishly engaged, together with the Chiang Kai-shek troops, in preparation for military operations against the People's Republic of China designed to restore the old régime. Senator Gore said he protested against the fact that the highest United States authorities on Formosa were placing their hopes in the realization of the myth of the restoration of Chiang Kai-shek's rule in China. The United States, he said, had tied itself to a sinking ship, called Formosa.

314. It was recently reported in the United States Press that the United States Government had decided to set up a United States atomic base on Taiwan to be manned by special units equipped with guided atomic missiles.

315. The Government of the People's Republic of China has made and is continuing to make every effort to settle all differences with the United States by means of peaceful negotiations. In particular, it has repeatedly proposed that the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China and of the United States should meet to find a way to reduce and eliminate tension in the Taiwan area. However, the Government of the United States has turned a deaf ear to these reasonable proposals of the Government of the People's Republic of China.

316. All these facts, and others too, bear witness to the fact that in the Taiwan area the threat of war is being increased as a result of the actions of the United States.

317. It should also be recalled that for seven years the United States Government has stubbornly blocked the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, thereby undermining the basic principles of the Organization and using it for its own reactionary purposes.

318. The "positions of strength" policy being pursued by the United States continues to intensify tension in the area of Korea. As is known, the United States has rejected the repeated proposals of the Governments of the People's Republic of China and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for a conference of the parties concerned to discuss the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea and the peaceful unification of the country.

319. In addition, the United States has, by a unilateral decision, refused to comply with the terms of the Armistice Agreement relating to the activity in Korean territory—both in the North and in the South—of an international commission, the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission; and it is also taking other steps designed to nullify the Agreement once and for all and to give itself a free hand in Korea. The United States has virtually converted South Korea into a full-scale military camp to be used as a springboard for aggression against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, China and other countries. The United States Command is preparing to establish atomic military bases in Korea and other territories under its control, to be used in the aggressive activity which it is planning.

320. The militarization of South Korea is proceeding without any restraint and at full speed. The fact that there are at present about thirty Syngman Rhee divisions in the small territory of South Korea makes it clear that virtually all Korean males fit for military service are under arms. At the time of the conclusion

of the Armistice Agreement the South Korean Army consisted of sixteen divisions, or about half its present strength. In 1956 the United States spent over \$400 million for guns, aircraft and other arms sent to Korea. On orders from Washington, the Syngman Rhee Government approved the allocation of approximately 51 per cent of its 1956 budget for military purposes—and this at a time when, as the United States Press admits, there are more than 200,000 persons suffering from leprosy in South Korea and an even greater number suffering from tuberculosis and other serious diseases.

321. Egged on and encouraged by the United States, Syngman Rhee's generals have begun to clamour even more loudly for a "march to the north" to seize the territory of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

322. Another grave source of danger to the cause of peace in the Far East is the activity of the United States in South Viet-Nam. There, as is known, the United States has made and continues to make every effort to turn South Viet-Nam into a springboard for aggression against the peoples of Asia. The United States has set up in the territory of South Viet-Nam a whole network of military bases and airfields from which subversive activities are carried out against the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam in violation of the established demarcation line, attacks are launched against that country's territory, and manoeuvres are held, for purposes of provocation, with the participation of United States air and naval forces. Over the past two years the United States has spent more than \$320 million for military purposes in South Viet-Nam under the programme of "assistance" to the South Viet-Nam Government. At the instigation of the United States, the South Viet-Nam authorities are hindering the work of the International Truce Supervisory Commission in Viet-Nam.

323. All these are facts, facts which show that the question proposed by the Soviet Union delegation for inclusion in the agenda of this session of the General Assembly really deserves the attention of the United Nations as a matter of the utmost urgency.

324. What indeed could be more important to the United Nations, which is dedicated to the maintenance of international peace and security, than to take, in good time, the necessary measures against all acts and attempts designed to prevent the peaceful coexistence of States to exacerbate international relations? And this, my delegation wishes to emphasize, is precisely the objective of the Soviet request.

325. The Ukrainian people ardently support the policy of the Soviet Union, based as it is on the desire for peaceful coexistence and friendly co-operation among all countries, including the United States. Such co-operation, regardless of differences in social and economic systems, is in the interest of the peoples of the whole world.

326. The broad development of international co-operation and the effective strengthening of the security of the peoples will not be possible unless the United States of America puts an end—not only in word, but in deed—to its aggressive and subversive activities, which are poisoning the international atmosphere and increasing the threat of a new war.

327. It is the duty of the eleventh session of the General Assembly to give its immediate attention to the question proposed by the Soviet delegation, and to use its authority, the authority of the United Nations, to remove the obstacles that have recently been placed

in the way of increasing confidence among countries and of strengthening peace and security.

328. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR firmly supports the Soviet request to include in the agenda of this session the "Question of aggressive acts by the United States of America constituting a threat to peace and security".

329. Mr. MAKIEDO (Yugoslavia): It has been the consistent policy of my Government not to oppose inclusion in the agenda of the General Assembly of items proposed by any Member State, without prejudice to its position on the subject. My delegation will therefore vote against part B of the sixth report of the General Committee [A/3533], without entering into the substance of the matter and without prejudice to its position in this regard.

330. The PRESIDENT: We will now proceed to the vote on the recommendation of the General Committee that the proposed item not be included in the agenda of the present session [A/3533].

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Guatemala, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favor:* Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iraq, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece.

*Against:* India, Jordan, Poland, Romania, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Egypt.

*Abstaining:* Indonesia, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, Yemen, Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, Finland.

*The recommendation was adopted by 52 to 13, with 12 abstentions.*

331. The PRESIDENT: Since the recommendation of the General Committee has been adopted, the item proposed by the Soviet Union will not appear on the agenda of the General Assembly.

332. The Assembly will now hear explanations of vote.

333. Mr. EL KOHEN (Morocco) (*translated from French*): My delegation abstained in the vote on the inclusion of an item entitled "Question of aggressive acts by the United States of America constituting a threat to peace and security", proposed by the USSR. My delegation would like briefly to explain why it abstained. Morocco wishes to state that it has always been and always will be in favour of including in the agenda any item that falls within the scope of the principles of the United Nations Charter. From that standpoint, we feel that no discussion should be avoided. Any question that concerns the United Nations and the principles of international peace, co-operation, friendship and security which underlie it, should be discussed by the United Nations. To refuse to discuss such questions is an admission of guilt. The principle of ample discussion of problems affecting international

relations is an intangible but essential principle which we continue firmly to support.

334. The United Nations has often been compared to a large family, and we believe it is. We feel that the members of this large family should not fear explanations but, on the contrary, they should seek them, because by frankly facing all the problems which divide the world today, by discussing them calmly, without tension or passion, in a spirit of co-operation and mutual friendship, only thus can we contribute towards solving them, and only thus promote peace among the members of this great family of the United Nations, in short, promote world peace and security.

335. We are therefore in favour of the principle of including any item in the agenda. That being so, the logical step would have been to vote for the inclusion of the item under consideration and not to abstain in the vote. Yet we abstained. Why? Simply for reasons of justice and the search for truth. We feel that the title of the item: "Question of aggressive acts by the United States of America"—and I stress the word "aggressive"—is ambiguous and tendentious. It expresses a bias or prejudgement and could give rise to an erroneous interpretation of the truth. First of all, we do not think that the United States, that great democratic people which the world admires for its work, its dynamism and its organization, can be an aggressive country. Secondly, if people wish us to believe that, before we make even a simple moral judgement, we ask for proof. But proof has not been submitted. To be sure, as one distinguished representative has said, we are neither a jury nor a court. I wish to add that, equally, we cannot pass judgement or give decisions. Yet since what we say here reflects the opinion of the Governments of the world and the opinion of States, and since we represent the public opinion of our own countries, we cannot admit an *a priori* accusation unless we have proof of its truth. Now, for want of proof to the contrary, we should reserve our opinion and base it on justice and truth. The very wording of the item prejudices the substance and expresses a judgement before anything has been demonstrated, before anything at all has been proved. In the circumstances, the only possible course open to us was to abstain; this was the course of truth and impartiality. This is why we acted as we did.

336. Mr. SINGH (India): Since the hour is late, I do not wish to make a long explanation of the vote of my delegation. I wish to explain that the vote cast by my delegation is in no sense an expression of our position on the substance of the item. We have voted in the same way that we did at the 110th meeting of the General Committee, with regard only to the matter of inclusion.

337. Mr. SHAHA (Nepal): In view of the lateness of the hour, I shall be very brief. Normally, my delegation would have voted for the inclusion of any item in the agenda of the General Assembly. However, due to special circumstances, we were not able to vote in favour of the item proposed by the USSR. There were two reasons for the vote which we cast.

338. First, in the opinion of my delegation, the consideration of the item proposed by the USSR would merely enhance the atmosphere of "cold war" which, in our opinion, is not at all conducive to the interests of world peace. Secondly, our respect for the decision taken by the General Committee in its recommendation to the General Assembly persuaded us to abstain in the voting.

339. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet Union delegation's request for the inclusion in the General Assembly's agenda of an item entitled "Question of aggressive acts by the United States of America constituting a threat to peace and security" has unfortunately failed to receive the necessary support from the General Assembly, and therefore I deem it necessary to make the following statement.

340. The Soviet delegation's intention in submitting its request was to help the United Nations in the successful fulfilment of its basic task—to maintain and strengthen peace and to avert another war. It is more than unforgivable that at the present time when the situation is being further complicated by the aggressive acts of the United States, indifference should be displayed to the future course of relations between States and whether they are proceeding in the direction of peace or war.

341. The Soviet people and the peoples of the whole world, including the American people, want to avert war so that normal friendly relations can be established between all States, regardless of their geographical position or social system.

342. Can this noble aim be attained? The Soviet Government is convinced that it can, provided that all differences that are pushing the world in the direction of war are settled and that international relations are based on the principle of peaceful coexistence. This, in our opinion, is the only course which offers a real possibility of settling urgent and controversial international problems by peaceful means. If some of the most recent acts of the United States are viewed in this light they will be found to be contrary to the peaceful aspirations of peoples and the principles of the United Nations. These acts aggravate rather than improve the situation; they increase rather than reduce tension between States.

343. We are not alone in our interpretation of the unwillingness to consider the item proposed by the Soviet Union as fear on the part of the United States Government that its aggressive acts will be exposed to world public opinion.

344. The Soviet Union, for its part, acknowledging all its obligations before the peoples of the world, will redouble its efforts to preserve peace to increase confidence among States.

### ***Progress of work of the eleventh session of the General Assembly and closing date of the session***

#### **SEVENTH REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE (A/3534)**

345. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I should like to express briefly some of the Soviet delegation's views on this draft resolution. The Soviet delegation is in favour of expediting the work of this session and believes that this can be done first of all by organizing the work of the Committees more efficiently. We feel bound however to support the view that all items before Committees should be discussed thoroughly and that their consideration should not be limited artificially by lack of time, because in that case the substance of the questions under discussion would suffer and that in turn would be contrary to the principles and tradition of the United Nations. This must not be allowed to happen.

346. Accordingly, if during the course of our work it becomes clear that consideration of these questions will not be completed by the proposed target date, namely 23 February, additional time should be provided for their examination.

347. Secondly, the Soviet delegation opposes the proposal to retain the so-called "Hungarian question" on the Assembly's agenda in any form whatsoever and proposes that the reference to item 67 of the General Assembly's agenda in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution should be deleted.

348. I feel that there is no need to explain this proposal in detail since the Soviet delegation's position on this question has been adequately stated during the course of this session.

349. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union has moved an amendment, namely, to delete the words "and 67" at the end of operative paragraph 3. I will put that amendment to the vote first.

*The amendment was rejected by 60 votes to 7, with 3 abstentions.*

350. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution recommended by the General Committee [A/3534].

*The draft resolution was adopted by 67 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.*

*The meeting rose at 7.40 p.m.*