

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



AD HOC POLITICAL COMMITTEE 9th

MEETING

Tuesday, 27 November 1951, at 10.30 a.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

	Page
Complaint of hostile activities of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania and Albania, as well as the Governments of Czechoslovakia and Poland, against Yugoslavia (A/1946, A/AC.53/L.10) (<i>continued</i>).	43

Chairman: Mr. Selim SARPEN (Turkey).

Complaint of hostile activities of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania and Albania, as well as the Governments of Czechoslovakia and Poland, against Yugoslavia (A/1946, A/AC.53/L.10) (*continued*)

[Item 68]*

1. Mr. DJILAS (Yugoslavia), continuing his enumeration of the factors and incidents which had contributed to the deterioration of relations between Yugoslavia, on the one hand, and the USSR and the countries of eastern Europe, on the other, emphasized the importance of the arbitrary abrogation by the latter of their treaties of mutual assistance with his country. The initiative for that move had been taken by the USSR, and signified that Yugoslavia could not expect any further guarantees of non-aggression by the Soviet Union Government. Similarly, the other governments of eastern Europe, following the example of the USSR, had unilaterally severed forty-six political, economic, cultural and other agreements with the Yugoslav Government. Those unilateral actions in fact constituted violations of international law, and reduced to hollow words the repeated assertions of Soviet officials that international treaties must be implemented in the form in which they had been signed.

2. Concurrently, the Soviet Union had imposed upon Yugoslavia an economic blockade designed to disrupt its economy, and had exerted economic pressures in the belief that it could thereby provoke an irreparable economic crisis. By compelling other east European countries to follow its example, it hoped to bring about a severance of economic relations between Yugoslavia and its neighbours.

3. As early as 1948, Yugoslavia had begun to feel the effects of the deliberate economic discrimination practised by the Soviet Union Government and the governments of eastern Europe. Taking advantage of Yugoslavia's shortages in oil, machinery and other essential raw materials and capital goods, those governments had gradually reduced their exports of those products to the point where, by the middle of 1949, all trade had virtually ceased to exist between Yugoslavia and the USSR, Albania, Hungary, Romania, Czechoslovakia and Poland. At the same time, a number of those countries had, for political reasons, obstructed or rejected outright proposals to renew trade negotiations and to conclude new trade agreements. The pretexts invoked to justify those arbitrary measures had been mere fabrications; they had been prompted exclusively as a means of exercising political pressure. The organizers of the economic blockade had been fully aware that Yugoslavia's economy depended to a large extent upon imports from the eastern European countries. The withholding of essential raw materials had been intended to paralyse the main branches of Yugoslav industry and transport, while the refusal to provide capital goods had resulted in huge losses. The value of capital installations contracted for and undelivered had amounted to some 360 million dollars. The economic blockade had been all the more effective as Yugoslavia had had no means of re-orienting her foreign trade.

4. In addition to cutting off normal trade with Yugoslavia, the eastern European countries had unilaterally severed or reduced transport and other communications with that country. Particularly heavy damage had been done to Yugoslav navigation on the Danube. Simultaneously, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria had discontinued deliveries in settlement reparations and the restitution of property required under the terms of their respective peace treaties with Yugoslavia. That

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

flagrant violation of international treaty obligations was in clear contradiction with the United Nations Charter and with the assertions of responsible USSR statesmen concerning economic co-operation.

5. To supplement the economic blockade and political pressure brought to bear against Yugoslavia, the USSR Government and the authorities of the eastern European countries had organized and trained bands to carry out subversive, terrorist and espionage activities inside the country. After completing their missions, many of the people employed in those bands had succeeded in returning home unscathed. Responsible government authorities, sometimes even cabinet ministers, of the countries bordering on Yugoslavia had openly participated in perpetrating violence, spreading propaganda and panic, and organizing sabotage against the Yugoslav régime. Yugoslav officials and ordinary citizens had been made use of by the terrorist groups, often very effectively. Yugoslav citizens, who had emigrated to neighbouring countries, had often been infiltrated illegally across the border as trained and armed terrorists charged with fomenting civil war in their country of origin. Many of them were graduates of special secret training centres scattered along the frontier and financed by the governments of the neighbouring countries. There was firm evidence that Soviet officers participated in the activities of those centres. The campaign of terrorism was accompanied by violent anti-Yugoslav propaganda in the press and radio of the Soviet bloc, the purpose of which was not only to deceive the peoples of those countries but to conceal the terrorist activities of their governments and justify their aggressive actions. As a signatory of the London Protocol on Acts of Terrorism, the USSR Government had recognized that the infiltration of terrorist groups into the territory of another State was a violation of international law. Yet it proceeded to abet and sanction such repeated violations.

6. The violations of fundamental human rights of Yugoslav citizens both in the Soviet Union and in the eastern European countries constituted still another weapon of aggressive pressure exerted against Yugoslavia. It took the form of terrorism, forcible detention, and persecution.

7. Within the Soviet Union, Yugoslav citizens were denied repeated requests for repatriation, and were prevented, by arrest and ill-treatment, from seeking the normal consular protection of their country. In many cases, they were deprived of their means of livelihood. In the countries of the Soviet bloc they were often forced, under threat of expulsion and confiscation of their property, to accept foreign citizenship in violation of the peace treaties. Many Yugoslav citizens in those countries had been arrested and murdered solely because they persisted in retaining Yugoslav nationality. Thus, the Soviet Union Government and the governments of the countries under its domination, flouted the basic principles governing the legal status of foreigners.

8. Yugoslav children were still being forcibly detained within the USSR, and subjected to an education desi-

gned to sow the seeds of hatred against their mother country. Under the pretext that the children themselves did not choose to return, they were kept from all contact with their embassy officials and denied opportunities for repatriation. It was difficult to reconcile such Soviet practices with the USSR's clamour in the Third Committee for the return of Soviet children from Western Germany. Romania and Bulgaria were likewise guilty of the forcible detention of Yugoslav children in their territory. Yugoslav requests for their return had proved unavailing. In defiance of their own national legislation as well as of the Declaration of Human Rights and of the Charter, the Soviet Union and the countries within its orbit continued to use Yugoslav children as a political pawn.

9. A further violation of human rights was practised by Yugoslavia's neighbours against Yugoslav national minorities within their borders, in open contravention of the human rights clauses of the peace treaties. By systematic political and social persecution, an attempt was being made to denationalize groups of Yugoslav citizens residing in Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria and Albania.

10. The use of their mother tongue was forbidden in schools, books in Yugoslav dialects were confiscated and leaders of the Yugoslav minorities were arrested. In addition, the Hungarian authorities had, in 1949, initiated the forcible deportation of thousands of Yugoslav residents to the eastern regions of the country, justifying such transfers of population on the ground that the persons moved were fascists and bandits. The objective of Hungary's actions was palpably the annihilation of its Yugoslav minority.

11. A similar policy was being pursued by Romania, where large numbers of Yugoslavs were deported by troops and the police to labour camps in cattle box-cars. Many were forced to work, for example, on the Danube-Black Sea canal at present under construction. It was significant that those mass deportations took place generally at the same time as army manoeuvres and were justified to the Romanian people by war-mongering propaganda against Yugoslavia.

12. Hungary and Romania were thus violating human rights guaranteed both by the peace treaties with Yugoslavia and by bilateral agreements. The collective penalization of Yugoslav minorities in those countries was taking the form of their total annihilation, a form of genocide.

13. The statistics of frontier incidents showed a steady increase between 1948 and 1951, the total to date being 2,519. In that connexion it might be remarked that incidents had multiplied when it became known in the summer of 1949 that credits might be granted to Yugoslavia. The incidents provoked clearly aimed at maintaining tension within Yugoslavia and furnished clear proof of the aggressive pressure exercised by the USSR and other eastern European governments against Yugoslavia.

14. In October 1949, during the general Assembly's fourth session, the Yugoslav representative had drawn the attention of the First Committee to an incident on the Hungarian frontier. At the 77th meeting of the General Committee, during the present session, the USSR representative alleged in an attempt to conceal the occurrence of provocative incidents against Yugoslavia, that the Yugoslav representative had claimed on that occasion that Yugoslavia had been invaded by Hungarian armed forces. However, the summary records (302nd and 308th meetings of the First Committee) clearly showed that the Yugoslav representative had not suggested that his country had been invaded and that the USSR representative had not at that time put forward the allegations he had made at the present session.

15. Furthermore, not only had the Yugoslav Government's proposals to set up joint commissions been refused by the neighbouring governments, but the commissions which did exist, as for instance in Bulgaria, had been prevented from functioning. It should also be noted that no Yugoslav soldier had ever been found alive or dead on the territory of a neighbouring country. Nor had any answer been vouchsafed by the governments of those countries to the Yugoslav Government's notes on frontier incidents.

16. Turning to the question of military pressure and the violation of the military clauses of the peace treaties, Mr. Djilas pointed out that the numerical strength of the armed forces of Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania greatly exceeded the levels laid down in the relevant articles of those treaties. The total forces were far greater than peace time conditions warranted and were, moreover, further increased by the presence in Hungary and Romania of very large units of the USSR armed forces. Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania had used the pretexts of labour service, police force and semi-military organizations to conceal the true strength of their armed forces. Legislation providing for longer periods of compulsory military service was being introduced. The clauses in the peace treaties relating to the acquisition and production of certain kinds of arms were also being violated. Thus, at the present time, Bulgaria possessed 400 aircraft instead of the 90 which were authorized, as well as 400 tanks which, like most of the aircraft, were of USSR origin.

17. Military pressure and military preparations against Yugoslavia took the form of army exercises and large-scale manœuvres on the frontiers. According to the evidence of reliable witnesses, USSR officers and generals had been present at the great Hungarian military demonstrations held at the Yugoslav frontier in the autumn of 1950. In 1951, nearly all the Bulgarian units, permanently stationed within a 35-kilometre zone on the frontier, had moved westwards towards the border. Throughout the year those units had been engaged in constructing permanent firing posts and fortifications. The significance of those movements and manœuvres was borne out by the anti-Yugoslav propaganda spread among the troops. Refugees from

Bulgaria, Albania, Romania and Hungary had stated that commanding officers in addressing their soldiers always described Yugoslavia as "enemy number one" and explained that the United States, having failed to provoke a third world war in Korea, had decided to use Titoist Yugoslavia as a pretext for starting hostilities. The strategic approaches leading to Yugoslav territory had been heavily obstructed with trenches, mines and barbed wire and the populations in those zones had been evacuated. Intensive road building activity was being carried out on the Bulgarian side of the frontier, while the Hungarians were hurriedly repairing fortifications in various sectors. New aerodromes were being built and old ones repaired or enlarged. Bulgaria had seventeen aerodromes while between 1947 and 1951 Romania had increased the number of its aerodromes from twenty-eight to sixty, eighteen of which were under construction at present. New aerodromes were being built in Hungary as well.

18. The official military budgets of those countries were fictitious and an impartial international inquiry—if one were held—would undoubtedly reveal the gravity of the situation as regards both the violation of the military clauses of the peace treaties and the aggressive military preparations against Yugoslavia. That tremendous military activity which imposed an almost unbearable burden on war-devastated countries was directed against a peace-loving country which neither wanted nor was able to threaten its neighbours. It did not ask for co-operation or friendship; it only asked to be left in peace.

19. The USSR Government, whose deeds belied its words, used the governments of the eastern European countries as its tools and instigated military preparation and provocation. But it could, if it wished, successfully influence the eastern neighbours of Yugoslavia, enjoining them not to hamper that country's peaceful development. Indeed, so great was the influence which the Soviet Union wielded over those countries that relations between them and Yugoslavia depended primarily on its good will.

20. In conclusion, Mr. Djilas stated the following facts:

(a) The USSR Government, together with the governments of the eastern European countries, had for over three years openly exercised all-round aggressive pressure on Yugoslavia in order to prevent that country's peaceful development and destroy its national independence;

(b) Every effort made during that time by the Yugoslav Government to solve, by peaceful and direct negotiation, its differences with the governments of the USSR and of the eastern European countries, had failed because those governments had responded to its numerous overtures by new acts of aggressive pressure;

(c) By pursuing their hostile activities against Yugoslavia, those governments had aggravated the tension existing in that region of Europe;

(d) The responsible representatives of those governments had, in their public statements, stimulated hostile activity against the independence and territorial integrity of Yugoslavia ;

(e) There was no doubt that those governments were exercising military pressure and carrying out military preparations against Yugoslavia ;

(f) Increased pressure was at the present time made manifest by the more and more numerous and more and more serious incidents that were occurring on the Yugoslav frontiers.

21. The Yugoslav Government had appealed to the United Nations in the belief that only concerted effort

could eliminate the tension and ensure Yugoslavia's peaceful development and independence, as well as world peace. It was the duty of every State to call on the United Nations organs for assistance in seeking ways for the peaceful adjustment of any situation which increased world tension and endangered international security. In submitting its complaint, the Yugoslav Government had only fulfilled its obligations both in regard to its country's national independence and to world peace. He therefore submitted for the Committee's consideration a draft resolution (A/AC. 53/L. 10) calling for appropriate action by the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.