

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
ELEVENTH SESSION
Official Records



**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 36th
MEETING**

Monday, 25 February 1957,
at 10.50 a.m.

New York

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 70:

Complaint by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of intervention by the United States of America in the domestic affairs of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and its subversive activity against those States (*continued*)..... 161

Chairman: Mr. Selim SARPER (Turkey).

AGENDA ITEM 70

Complaint by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of intervention by the United States of America in the domestic affairs of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and its subversive activity against those States (A/3442, A/SPC/10, A/SPC/L.14)

1. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the United States policy of interference in the domestic affairs of other States was fraught with serious consequences for the peace and security of the peoples. The Soviet Union had placed the question before the United Nations because of its desire to eliminate all obstacles to co-operation between States, and thereby to create a healthier international atmosphere. The duty of the United Nations was to maintain international security and to prevent any new war; it could not, therefore, ignore the dangerous acts which were being carried out by some Member States against others. It should see that all countries observed the provisions of the Charter by practising tolerance and living together in peace with one another as good neighbours.

2. United States interference in the domestic affairs of other countries was not a matter of chance; it was part and parcel of United States foreign policy, the object of which was to subject the world to United States leadership, and thus, in effect, to secure the domination of the monopolies. The socialist countries, which pursued a policy of peace and were trying to apply the principle of peaceful coexistence between all sovereign States, were a stumbling-block in the way of those imperialist plans. Consequently, reactionary circles in the United States were attempting to restore the capitalist system in those countries and to maintain tension in Europe and throughout the world; and for that purpose they were organizing military alliances under United States leadership, establishing large numbers of bases in foreign territory, stepping up the armaments race, and opposing all practical proposals aimed at the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction. The most recent manifestation of that policy was the so-called Eisenhower Doctrine, by means of which the United States Government was trying to establish its

domination in the countries of the Near and Middle East and to prevent the development of economic and cultural relations between the countries of Asia and Africa and the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies. The United States was also compelling its allies to employ discriminatory trade practices against the socialist countries, thus creating an abnormal situation. Finally, it was conducting a campaign of slanderous propaganda designed to foment hatred against the peoples' democracies and to erect a barrier between them and the rest of the world.

3. Irrefutable facts, many statements by political leaders, and documents published by the United States Government, showed that the subversive activity which was being carried on against the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies was being organized officially, as part of United States foreign policy. As was well known, the United States Congress was pursuing the unprecedented course of openly financing such activity. Hundreds of millions of dollars had already been spent for that purpose since the promulgation of the Mutual Security Act in 1951. In 1956, the appropriation for ventures of that kind had been raised from \$100 million to \$125 million. Moreover, it was admitted in the United States Press itself that such appropriations represented only a small part of the funds actually spent by United States Government organs in their "secret war" against the peace-loving countries. The 1951 Act was patently subversive. It provided that the money in question was to be used, *inter alia*, for the formation of auxiliary units for the support of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; such units were to be made up of persons who resided in, or had fled from, the Soviet Union or the peoples' democracies. It was a significant fact that, under the Act, such appropriations for subversive activities were directly linked with the activities of the North Atlantic bloc, whose objective was to prepare war against the peace-loving nations.

4. Some United States politicians had indeed been quite frank about the goals aimed at by the United States Government. Mr. Kersten, one of the sponsors of the Mutual Security Act, had said in the House of Representatives that the Act provided a method whereby the United States could render aid to underground movements in the Communist countries. One of the aims, he had said, was to spread fear in those countries, the "liberation" of which would require not merely propaganda and parliamentary manoeuvres but also strong action at the proper time. Clearly, therefore, according to that programme, the United States was to play an active part in the forcible "liberation" of the peoples' democracies, in particular by methods of terror and subversion. Senator McCarran had said in the Senate that United States propaganda would begin to bring results as soon as it was geared to the overthrow of the Soviet "dictatorship" by all means at the United States Government's disposal, an objective which the United States Government should pursue by supporting any insurgent movements that might exist

in the Communist States. That aggressive attitude on the part of the United States inevitably caused concern among all peoples, who regarded it as a real threat to peace and security.

5. The First Committee, at the sixth and seventh sessions of the General Assembly, had already considered the question of the subversive activities carried on by some countries; a number of Member States had drawn attention on those occasions to the aggressive nature of the so-called Mutual Security Act and had proposed that the United States should be called upon to stop interfering in the internal affairs of other countries. However, the ruling circles of the United States had turned a deaf ear to those appeals and had intensified their subversive campaign against the peoples' democracies.

6. In the spring of 1956, a Programme of Political Offensive against World Communism had been drawn up in the United States. It provided for the organization, support and equipment of counter-revolutionary bands, trained to prepare uprisings in the socialist countries. The author of the programme, who was the chairman of the board of an important commercial concern, had with cynical frankness advocated the formation of anti-Communist organizations and of an officers' corps of *émigrés* from Eastern Europe, to be kept available for emergency use. His detailed programme had been considered and fully approved by United States Government circles, and had been published in the *Congressional Record*.

7. The political leaders of the United States were still openly supporting subversive activities against the lawful Governments of the socialist countries. In 1952, Mr. Dulles had enunciated his policy of "liberation" of the peoples' democracies, adding that it had already been applied in certain places. Subsequently, on becoming Secretary of State, he had repeatedly proclaimed that subversive activity was part of his country's policy. In January 1953, speaking in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, he had proposed that the United States should pass from the policy of "the containment of" the USSR, which had become inadequate, to a policy of "liberation". On another occasion, he had said that the United States would never abandon its subversive activities as long as the situation in the socialist countries remained unchanged. The President of the United States himself, in his 1955 Christmas message to the nations of Eastern Europe, had in fact called upon the peoples of that area to overthrow their present Governments and to establish a régime acceptable to the United States. A special statement issued by the White House on 30 December 1955 had affirmed that the "liberation" of the peoples of the socialist countries would always remain a major goal of United States foreign policy.

8. The reasons for that United States policy were easy to understand. In the socialist countries, all resources and means of production belonged to the people. Their national economies were rapidly developing, and workers enjoyed genuine freedom, namely, freedom from exploitation. Consequently, ruling circles in the United States were seeking to restore in those countries the rule of the big landlords and capitalists.

9. If certain hypocritical statements were to be believed, the adoption of the Mutual Security Act and the appeals directed to the peoples of Eastern Europe to revolt did not prove that the United States was interfering in the domestic affairs of other countries. Unfortunately, the fact demonstrated that the United

States Government was constantly organizing subversion against certain States, and that that activity was part of its official policy. The United States was establishing numerous espionage and sabotage networks, which maintained close liaison with the United States Government organs from which they received their funds and instructions.

10. For example, the Central Intelligence Agency, headed by Mr. Allen Dulles, was smuggling saboteurs into the peoples' democracies and equipping anti-government groups with a view to armed intervention. That had been abundantly confirmed by recent events in Hungary. The Central Intelligence Agency had set up numbers of groups instructed to engage in acts of sabotage, such as the Crusade for Freedom and the Free Europe Committee. In 1951, an American Committee for the liberation of the peoples of Russia had been formed in New York to direct the activities of sabotage groups. The United States Press had openly stated that "special forces", of *émigrés*, were being organized in the United States and taught how to penetrate into foreign territory in isolated groups and engage in sabotage. Many groups were also being organized for the same purpose in Western Europe, particularly in the Federal Republic of Germany; some of them were composed of former Gestapo agents. The documents published by those organizations left no doubt as to their true purposes: to intensify efforts aimed at the overthrow of the Soviet régime and to collaborate with "liberation movements", by providing not only funds but also technical means.

11. At a press conference held in Moscow on 6 February 1957, the Soviet authorities had revealed a number of facts relating to the criminal activities of the United States subversion agencies. Statements by former United States intelligence agents had confirmed the fact that the United States Government had organized a large number of saboteur training centres on United States soil and in the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany. The men trained at those centres, equipped with weapons, radio transmitters, forged papers and other sabotage equipment, had been parachuted into Soviet territory by aircraft of the United States Air Force or had entered clandestinely by other means.

12. In its memorandum of 21 December 1956 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Government of the German Democratic Republic had cited numerous facts showing the widespread nature of the subversive activities carried on by the United States in that peace-loving country. Among other things, the memorandum revealed that the authorities of the United States sector in Berlin had had a tunnel made connecting their sector with the territory of the German Democratic Republic. The tunnel had been equipped with devices for intercepting communications of the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet armed forces. That action had been a flagrant violation of the sovereignty of the German Democratic Republic.

13. One of the countries into which the United States was sending large numbers of saboteurs was Hungary. Long before the armed rebellion by Fascist conspirators in that country, the United States authorities, in complicity with the authorities of West Germany, had organized armed counter-revolutionary groups which were to be sent into Hungary at a suitable moment. There were numerous facts to prove that at the time of the counter-revolutionary uprising, the United States authorities had smuggled saboteurs into Hungary. It

was obvious that the counter-revolutionary movement in Hungary had been doomed to failure from the outset; but the intervention of the insurgents and the saboteurs had inflicted extensive and useless suffering on the Hungarian people. Such were the practical aspects of the criminal "liberation" policy pursued by ruling groups in the United States, with the assistance of a number of subversive organizations organized and maintained at the expense of the United States taxpayer.

14. In the subversive campaign against the socialist countries, a special part had been played by Radio Free Europe, which was linked with the United States intelligence and sabotage services. During the Hungarian uprising, Radio Free Europe had been the headquarters from which instructions had been issued to the counter-revolutionaries and saboteurs. Thus, when the Hungarian Government had appealed for a cessation of hostilities, Radio Free Europe had immediately ordered the rebels to continue fighting, and had sent into Hungary a group of armed saboteurs who, by the use of terror methods, had attempted to intimidate and subjugate the peaceful people of Hungary. The activities of Radio Free Europe had assumed such alarming proportions that the people of the Federal Republic of Germany had become disturbed, and the Government of that country had had to take steps to calm public opinion.

15. In recent years, the United States had systematically invaded the air space of the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies, thereby grossly violating the sovereignty of those countries. In 1955, the United States military authorities had begun to send into the air space of the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies large balloons equipped with special apparatus, including aerophotographic devices and radio transmitters and receivers, and loaded with leaflets calling for acts of terrorism and sabotage, and sometimes even with explosives for use in such acts. Those balloons and their equipment had been manufactured in the United States. According to information at present in the possession of the Soviet Government, the United States military authorities were launching the balloons from United States bases located on the territory of certain countries close to the Soviet Union. Such acts were a gross violation of the universally recognized principles of international law, which prohibited the invasion of the air space of sovereign States, and were contrary to the provisions of article 8 of the Convention on International Civil Aviation of 1944 signed at Chicago which had been ratified by the United States.

16. Thus, the United States authorities had used a variety of means for carrying on their subversive activities against the socialist countries. The Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania, Albania and the German Democratic Republic had lodged official protests against those activities, which constituted a threat to the peace. Yet, far from putting a stop to such activities, the United States was in fact intensifying them. Such a course could not fail to aggravate the international situation.

17. The delegation of the Soviet Union, by its letters of 11 December 1956 (A/3442) and of 12 February 1957 (A/SPC/10), had brought the question before the General Assembly not because the socialist countries were unable to protect themselves against the subversive activities of the United States, but because United States interference in the internal affairs of other countries was contrary to the desire of the peoples to live in peace and to maintain good-neighbourly

relations, and because the Soviet Union was conscious of its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace.

18. In contrast to United States policy, which consisted of keeping the world "on the brink of war", the policy of the Soviet Union and all the socialist countries was to attempt to develop friendly relations between all peoples. The socialist countries continued to be resolutely in favour of absolute respect for the sovereignty of all States, of the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States, of the development of relations between States on the basis of equality and reciprocity, and of economic co-operation between all countries.

19. The policy of the Soviet Union and of the peoples' democracies toward the United States and other countries was based on the principle of peaceful coexistence between States having different political and social systems, a policy in keeping with the interests of peoples of all countries. No one could fail to realize the importance of normal relations between the United States and the socialist countries for the maintenance and consolidation of peace. Experience had shown that co-operation between the United States and the Soviet Union for the maintenance of international peace and security was perfectly feasible. The Soviet people and the people of the United States had been allies in the joint struggle against German Fascism. Their war-time friendship had been sealed with the blood of their finest sons, who had given their lives to ensure that war should be banished forever and that the peoples should henceforth prosper in peace.

20. Since the Soviet Union and the United States had been able to co-operate for the benefit of mankind in the difficult struggle which they had waged against Hitlerite Germany, it was also within their power, and it was their duty, not merely to maintain normal relations but to combine their efforts in maintaining and strengthening international peace. It was with that end in view that the Soviet Government, in 1956, had proposed the conclusion of a treaty of friendship and co-operation between the Soviet Union and the United States. Regrettably, that initiative of the Soviet Union on behalf of peace had met with no response from the United States Government.

21. It should be remembered that when diplomatic relations between the United States and the Soviet Union had been established, in 1933, relations between the two countries had been placed on a foundation of respect for the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States, a principle that had later been embodied in the Charter of the United Nations. Under the agreement signed between the United States and the Soviet Union in 1933, the Government of each of the two countries had undertaken to refrain from any form of interference in the internal affairs of the other country, and in particular to refrain from establishing, subsidizing or encouraging military organizations or groups having the aim of overthrowing the political or social system of either country. The Government of the Soviet Union unwaveringly respected the obligations it had assumed. On the other hand, the Government of the United States was deliberately disregarding its obligations under the 1933 agreement and under the Charter of the United Nations. In that connexion, it was not inappropriate to draw attention to the resolutions of the General Assembly which had a direct bearing on the question under discussion.

22. In its resolution 110 (II) adopted in November 1947 on "Measures to be taken against propaganda and the inciters of a new war", the General Assembly had condemned all forms of propaganda, in whatsoever country conducted, which was designed or likely to provoke or encourage any threat to the peace, and had requested the Governments of all Members to promote, by all means of publicity and propaganda available to them, friendly relations among nations based upon the Purposes and Principles of the Charter.

23. On 17 December 1954, the General Assembly had approved in its resolution 841 (IX) the provisions of the International Convention concerning the Use of Broadcasting in the Cause of Peace (Geneva, 1936), under which High Contracting Parties had mutually undertaken to prohibit and, if the occasion arose, to stop without delay the broadcasting within their respective territories of any transmission which to the detriment of good international understanding was of such character as to incite the population of any territory to acts incompatible with the internal order or the security of a territory of a High Contracting Party. The United Nations, whose duty it was to maintain international peace and security, had the obligation of calling to order all States which violated the Charter of the United Nations and international law, thereby endangering world peace. The United Nations should condemn the subversive activities carried on by the United States against other States, and should call on the Government of the United States to comply strictly with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations in its relations with all countries.

24. It was for those reasons that the delegation of the Soviet Union was submitting a draft resolution (A/SPC/L.14), which it appealed to the Special Political Committee to adopt. The Soviet delegation expressed the hope that an equitable settlement of that important question would help to bring about a relaxation of international tension, to re-establish normal good-neighbourly relations between the Member States of the United Nations and to consolidating international peace.

25. Mr. KNOWLAND (United States of America) reserved his delegation's right to comment at a later meeting on certain passages of the Soviet Union representative's statement and on the Soviet Union draft resolution (A/SPC/L.14).

26. Most of the accusations recently launched against the United States were an old story for the United Nations. The Soviet Union representative, as he himself had stated, had already set forth some of those charges in a draft resolution (A/C.1/685) submitted to the First Committee in 1951; he had forgotten to mention, however, that that draft resolution had been rejected by the First Committee at its 475th meeting by a vote of 39 to 5. The United States delegation was glad to say that the various false and sensational accusations which the Soviet Union had been levelling against it for the last ten years had invariably been rejected by overwhelming majorities in the Assembly; they were obviously part of a propaganda offensive against the United States.

27. By reviving those charges, the Soviet Union was merely trying to divert world attention from its own programme of using foreign Communist parties to undermine the Governments of free countries all over the world. It was also trying to obscure the truth revealed in recent discussions by the Assembly of the situation in Hungary, and for that purpose it was producing its own myth of United States intervention in

Eastern Europe. The United States once again called upon the Soviet Union to permit free access to Eastern Europe, and thus to the facts.

28. It was regrettable that the Assembly's time must again be taken up by those well-known charges, particularly at a time when it had grave international problems before it. Nevertheless, when the United States was falsely accused it could not remain silent.

29. The United States would naturally like to see improved and different conditions in Eastern Europe. It would never cease to hope that the captive peoples would again be permitted to enjoy the fundamental rights and freedoms recognized in the United Nations Charter. United States policy, however, was not inspired by any desire to menace Soviet security, for it was based on an objective on which all must agree: the maintenance of world peace.

30. The Soviet Union had presented a distorted picture of United States policies regarding Eastern Europe. As the Soviet Union Government well knew, the chief spokesmen of the United States foreign policy were President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles, and it was to them that he would refer. The two chief distortions of the USSR about United States policy toward Eastern Europe were that the United States wanted to impose its particular social or economic system on Eastern Europe and that it wanted to draw those countries into its orbit in order to make them its allies or to establish bases on their territories. Neither was true.

31. In an address at Dallas, Texas, on 27 October 1956, Mr. Dulles had said that it was the unadulterated wish of the United States that those peoples should have sovereignty restored to them and should have Governments of their own free choosing. He had stated that the United States did not condition economic ties with them on their adoption of any particular form of society. He had gone on to say that he did not look upon those nations as potential military allies but as friends and as part of a new and no longer divided Europe. In a television address on 31 October, President Eisenhower had made a similar statement. On 18 December Mr. Dulles had said that the United States would welcome any suggestion regarding the status of the satellite countries which might remove from the Soviet Union any fear that it would be militarily endangered if it facilitated their evolution towards independence.

32. In his inaugural address in January 1957, President Eisenhower had said that the people of the United States honoured the aspirations of the captive peoples for freedom, and he had again declared that the United States sought neither their military alignment nor any artificial integration with United States society. He had also addressed himself to the people of the USSR, wishing them fuller enjoyment of the rewards of their toil and looking forward to the establishment of friendly relations among all peoples.

33. The Soviet Union delegation seemed determined to misrepresent the United States as a Power bent on conquest and to that end it had produced a file of press clippings which proved nothing. If the Soviet leaders honestly sought to know what the true purposes of the United States were towards Eastern Europe and the entire world, they should study the statements that he had just cited.

34. He had, he thought, shown clearly that there was nothing in United States policy in which the Soviet

Union could find cause for alarm. The true causes of tension and unrest in Eastern Europe were to be sought elsewhere, in the complete and total suppression by the Soviet Government of every expression of independence. That state of affairs was the result of the aggressive policy and repressive actions of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union had denied the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of Eastern Europe for national independence; it had denied to those peoples basic human freedoms recognized in the Charter of the United Nations; it had imposed puppet Governments and had used its armed forces to keep those Governments in power; it had plundered the economies of those countries for the benefit of the Soviet State; it had forcibly converted the three Baltic Republics in 1940 into Soviet provinces, in violation of non-aggression treaties signed just a year previously; it had persecuted the churches and the faithful; it had preached hatred of the United States even in school-books; it had used every means to cut those peoples off from contact with the free world. It was not surprising, therefore, that those peoples were seeking to pierce the iron curtain which separated them from contact with the rest of the world. Clearly, it was the Soviet Union which had intervened directly in the internal affairs of the countries of Eastern Europe. Those were the real causes of tension in that part of the world. If the Soviet Union changed its policy, it would find its own security enhanced and the cause of international peace would be advanced.

35. No event had more clearly illustrated the nature of the tension in Eastern Europe than the uprising of the Hungarian people against their Soviet masters. On 20 February 1957 the Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary had published a most valuable report (A/3546) on the events in Hungary. He would mention only those facts which showed how absurd was the Soviet charge that the United States had instigated the Hungarian people's revolt.

36. In a letter (A/3521) to the Secretary-General of the United Nations dated 4 February 1957, Mr. Péter Mod, who signed himself Permanent Representative of Hungary to the United Nations, purported to explain the intervention of Soviet forces in Hungary. According to him the Hungarian Government had exercised its sovereign rights and had called for the assistance of Soviet troops stationed in Hungary under the Warsaw Treaty of 1955 so as to avoid further bloodshed and disorder and to defend the democratic order and the peoples' power. It seemed strange that the Hungarian Government had not called on the Hungarian army. The reason undoubtedly had been that even after years of Soviet rule in Hungary the régime was unable to rely on the sizable Hungarian army to suppress an anti-Soviet movement in Budapest. As for the allegation that Soviet troops had intervened to avoid further bloodshed and disorder, the fact was that their intervention had brought death to an estimated 25,000 Hungarians as well as to several thousand Russians. Lastly, Mr. Mod's allegations were contradicted by a telegram (A/3251) dated 1 November 1956 addressed to the Secretary-General and signed by Imre Nagy, President of the Council of Ministers of the Hungarian People's Republic, a telegram sent before the Hungarian patriots were crushed by Soviet tanks.

37. Mr. Mod's letter (A/3521) contained the only specific charges concerning the alleged activities of the United States at the time of the events in Hungary and,

even so, it mentioned only a handful of foreign agents and two or three broadcasts by Radio Free Europe. It was on the basis of such statements that the Special Political Committee was asked to believe that a foreign plot, resting on the work of some two dozen *émigré* agents, had caused the population of Budapest to rise *en masse* at the cost of 25,000 Hungarian lives. Clearly the real origin of the events must be sought not outside Hungary but inside. That fact was confirmed by an editorial from the Budapest newspaper *Szabad Nép* of 29 October 1956, protesting against the way in which events in Budapest had been reported in *Pravda* and explaining that the uprising had been a revolt by the Hungarian people who sought independence and democracy and that it was not the subversive work of foreign agents.

38. On 30 October 1956 the Soviet Union Government had issued a remarkable statement admitting that the presence of Soviet army units in Hungary could only cause even greater deterioration of the situation and stating that it had consequently given instructions to its military command to withdraw those units. There was not a word in that statement about outside instigation by the United States or by any other country and Moscow implicitly admitted that its army was fighting against a genuine patriotic uprising. On 2 November, however, after the Nagy Government had repudiated the Warsaw Treaty and declared Hungary's neutrality, hundreds of Soviet tanks had descended on Budapest. It was only then that Moscow had begun to claim that the United States had planned the mass uprising of the Hungarian people. The Soviet argument was therefore a mockery of the facts.

39. There were a number of different ways in which the General Assembly could deal with the question and his delegation would willingly make proposals if it thought that new and constructive resolutions were likely to have any influence on Soviet policy. There was, however, little reason to hope that that would be the case. The General Assembly had already adopted many resolutions concerning violations of the provisions of the Charter by the Soviet Union, particularly in the matter of Hungary. The Soviet Union had failed to observe those resolutions. It seemed pointless at that time for the General Assembly to adopt new ones on the subject. The need was for Soviet compliance.

40. Nevertheless, his delegation saw no need to despair. It looked forward to the time when the Soviet Union Government would see fit to restore to the peoples of Eastern Europe their national freedom, to open up their frontiers and to concentrate its efforts on promoting the security and welfare of its own people. Such measures would do much to ensure world peace. The Soviet Union Government would one day have to recognize that freedom in Eastern Europe was not incompatible with Soviet security. Progress along that road must be helped by the Soviet Union and its leaders.

41. The General Assembly had made devoted efforts to ensure peace, on the basis of the idea that disagreements between nations, no matter how stubborn, could be solved without war. The United States believed that the political warfare which the Soviet Union felt obliged to wage against the free world would one day cease. Given the assistance of the Soviet Union, it would be possible to end the conflict peacefully, in the justice and friendship for which humanity longed.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.