



Wednesday, 8 April 1953, at 3 p.m.

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

Page

Interference of the United States of America in the internal affairs of other States as manifested by the organization on the part of the Government of the United States of America of subversive and espionage activities against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the People's Republic of China, the Czechoslovak Republic and other peoples' democracies: report of the First Committee (A/2377)	693
Third report of the Credentials Committee (A/2374)	696

President: Mr. Lester B. PEARSON (Canada).

Interference of the United States of America in the internal affairs of other States as manifested by the organization on the part of the Government of the United States of America of subversive and espionage activities against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the People's Republic of China, the Czechoslovak Republic and other peoples' democracies: report of the First Committee (A/2377)

[Agenda item 71]

1. The PRESIDENT: It was agreed this morning [424th meeting] that there should be no general discussion of this report, though there will, of course, be an opportunity for explanations of vote. I again suggest that the explanations should not take longer than seven minutes.

Mr. Thors (Iceland), Rapporteur of the First Committee, presented the report of that Committee (A/2377).

2. The PRESIDENT: There is no draft resolution before the Assembly from the First Committee. However, an opportunity will be given to explain votes in connexion with the Czechoslovak draft resolution [A/L.148].

3. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Before a vote is taken on the Czechoslovak draft resolution on interference of the United States in the internal affairs of other States, the USSR delegation deems it necessary to make the following statement.

4. The Soviet Union delegation stated its views on this question fully when it was discussed in the First Committee. It maintains the position it outlined then and considers it essential to draw the General Assembly's attention to the fact that the enactment by the United States of the Acts of 10 October 1951 and 20 June 1952, which provide for the recruitment of

citizens of other States to form military detachments for purposes of diversion and terrorism, is a gross intervention in the domestic affairs of other States and is in flagrant contradiction to the elementary principles of international law and the fundamental provisions of the United Nations Charter.

5. For these reasons the USSR delegation supports the Czechoslovak draft resolution on this question and will accordingly vote in favour of it.

6. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): The Czechoslovak delegation, supported by the delegation of the Soviet Union, has charged that the United States escapee programme initiated last March under section 101 (a) of the Mutual Security Act is a programme of aggression and that the programme contradicts the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and is directed against peaceful collaboration and peaceful co-existence among peoples. The First Committee overwhelmingly rejected these charges. Only the five Soviet-bloc States—the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Byelorussian SSR and the Ukrainian SSR—voted in favour, while forty-one States voted against the charges and fourteen States abstained. Moreover, in subsequently explaining their votes, the representatives of several of the latter States told us that the reasons for their abstentions had little or nothing to do with the Czechoslovak charges. In the words of one of these representatives, the representative of Guatemala, their abstention should not be understood as meaning agreement with the virulent and unjust attacks on the United States by the Soviet bloc.

7. Here we are today in the Assembly, and let me re-emphasize that the question before us is whether the United States, by assisting escapees from the so-called peoples' democracies, is—and I quote from the first paragraph of the draft resolution—engaged in "acts of aggression and . . . interference in the

internal affairs of other States". That is the only question, and that single question is easily answered in the following words.

8. The United States should not be condemned for interfering in the private affairs of any State by helping to provide a modest sanctuary for escapees. It is the communist rulers who are to be condemned for interfering with the private rights of individuals and for doing it in such a brutal way as to make escapees inevitable. It is the fact of Soviet tyranny and its by-product, the Iron Curtain, that must be condemned, for, if there were no tyranny, there would be no need for electrified barbed wire, land mines, searchlights and patrols of vicious dogs. There would also be no tragedies such as that which last week smote Gabor Freud and his eight-year-old son, who was shot and killed by Hungarian frontier guards, and Mrs. Freud and her four-year-old daughter, who were seriously wounded. These are the kind of persons we call "escapees".

9. What do we actually mean by some of the words we are using? We have here in the United Nations a corps of interpreters who are one of the wonders of the modern world. They are as nearly perfect as it is possible for human beings to be in their work. Their accuracy is marvellous. Their good faith is never questioned. Therefore, when one of these interpreters interprets something into English which is obscure, we are forced to the conclusion that the speaker whose words are being interpreted was himself obscure. Two words which have occurred prominently in interpretations during the recent debate on the question of escapees are "deviationists" and "diversionists". In trying to figure out what these terms mean, beyond the obvious fact that they are not complimentary from the Soviet viewpoint, we are compelled to conclude that they refer to people who disagree with the government and who therefore want to get out, and that the reason why there is such strong feeling against those so-called "deviationists" and "diversionists" is because the rulers of the communist bloc were once deviationists and diversionists themselves, and therefore know what big things can be accomplished by angry men who are well organized in the service of a cause.

10. So far as the United States is concerned, we were largely settled by people who deviated from the established beliefs in their country of origin. We are a nation of escapees. It is for that reason that our programme for aiding escapees is basically a typical American programme. It is essentially for that reason that the escapees and the other lovers of freedom all over the world can feel sure that we will never forsake them.

11. A vote against the Czechoslovak draft resolution is a vote for human liberty, it is a vote against the "iron curtain". I urge that the draft resolution be rejected.

12. Mr. CASTILLO ARRIOLA (Guatemala) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation had occasion to explain its abstention in the First Committee and had not intended to do so again here; however, the statement of Mr. Lodge, the United States representative, compels me to reaffirm our position, which he quoted correctly.

13. It is my understanding that each of the delegations to the United Nations assesses every item that comes before the General Assembly in the light of two considerations: first, the intrinsic value of the item as such, that is to say, its general aspects which concern all countries; and, second, its repercussions on the national problems of that delegation's own State. It was this latter consideration alone which determined the Guatemalan delegation's abstention. This leads me to restate the position underlying that abstention.

14. I shall try to be as brief as possible. I wish to say, first of all, that the Republic of Guatemala, whenever an international event has given it the opportunity so to do, has recognized and categorically affirmed the undeniable and unquestioned right of all States and all peoples to self-determination and the free exercise of their sovereignty, in an international atmosphere based on mutual respect and non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States. It is obvious that such conditions are the logical, natural and legal corner-stone on which the United Nations rests. We in Guatemala recognize and therefore affirm the right of Member States to denounce to the United Nations any violation, real or attempted, of the international guarantees of non-intervention, or any infringement of their sovereignty.

15. We therefore recognize that in principle the Czechoslovak delegation exercised a legitimate right in Paris, at the sixth session, when it first submitted its accusation against the United States, for it considered the Mutual Security Act to be a threat to the sovereignty of its country and that of other peoples' democracies. Nevertheless we must recognize that, both then and now, when the question has again been raised, the United States was the first to agree most graciously, through its delegation, that the General Assembly should consider this item, discuss it fully and ascertain the truth for all the world to know.

16. We felt that we were dealing with a really well-founded matter. It was with great interest and close attention that we followed a long debate, which visibly degenerated into a discussion of political matters that were certainly alien to the problem itself and most regrettably distracted our attention from the main theme. The gravity of the subject itself was overlooked—the immutable supremacy of the principle of non-intervention, the jealous observance of which is required of all countries, great or small, but particularly of us small countries. Instead of evidence, we heard a number of quotations from statements by people or newspapers, and our conclusion was that a series of accusations had been made against the United States Government but had not in effect been proved; finally a draft resolution was submitted, which was no more than a summary of this amorphous discussion.

17. My delegation could neither support a draft resolution of that type, submitted in that form, nor associate itself with such an attitude, despite the fact that the principle of non-intervention, so precious to us, was involved. Furthermore, this item has a profound influence on problems which are now confronting my country and which have obliged it to explain, on principle, the reasons for its abstention.

18. We could not but listen with deep satisfaction to Mr. Lodge's statements when he said that in a climate

of liberty citizens had, and continually exercised, the right to express their opinions as private individuals, however important a political position they held, without thereby involving or defining the official position or policies of the government of the country concerned.

19. We take note of that official statement and we accept it; hence we cannot agree that the opinions of private individuals can be used as grounds for condemning the United States Government, as the Czechoslovak draft resolution demands. We take note of that official statement and we accept it, because, in Guatemala, we have a democracy which is a living example of our American love of liberty and in which the citizens possess—and fully exercise—the right to express their opinions, regardless of their political position, without thereby implying that those opinions represent the official views or policies of the government. This right is a *sine qua non* of man as a citizen and it should exist in every free country like mine. We are prepared to maintain this freedom at all costs and to deny that such private opinions can be regarded as incriminating my Government, as has been claimed, first by persons who are discredited in the eyes of the world, and, more recently, by a former United States ambassador, Mr. Braden. Although he is a private individual, Mr. Braden made insinuations which were an insult to any country, and to the sovereignty of the Latin American States, and which we vehemently reject.

20. In a statement at Dartmouth College last month, Mr. Spruille Braden said that since communism was an international, and not a national, affair, its suppression, even by force, in an American country would not constitute an intervention. He said also—and I am quoting—"it can cause us to lose this hemisphere just as we lost China". Such an absurd argument did not pass unnoticed by American public opinion, including *The New York Times*, which said that, notwithstanding the excuse of anti-communism, Mr. Braden's proposals were a dangerous incitement to intervention. Nevertheless, we in Guatemala shall not be so ingenuous as to confuse Mr. Braden and the interests which he represents with the honest Government of the United States. That is something quite different. Nothing good can, in fact, be expected from any intervention which would destroy the basis of the brotherly relations among the American countries. We know that these ideas are not shared by the United States Government, which has resolutely and honestly reaffirmed the principle of non-intervention and its desire to promote respect and friendship among all nations. There are numerous examples of this policy. Nevertheless, Mr. Braden's prejudiced statements are undoubtedly doing a disservice to the aims of international brotherhood.

21. Owing to this attitude, and because of a systematic campaign of hostility towards Guatemala, we have been obliged to abstain in this vote in order to safeguard the principle of non-intervention; our position has also been determined by the fact that, from words, our enemies have passed to deeds, and in my country, only fifteen days ago, there was an armed revolt which was expecting military reinforcements from abroad. This is the only reason why my country and my Government will abstain, thus declaring our democratic faith and categorically affirming the principle of non-intervention. This abstract principle, so far removed from the ques-

tion raised by Czechoslovakia, is the reason for my delegation's abstention.

22. Mr. FERRER VIEYRA (Argentina) (*translated from Spanish*): I wish to explain to the General Assembly our vote on the matter under consideration.

23. My delegation will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution submitted by Czechoslovakia. We acted similarly in the First Committee, consistently with the clear and definite line of conduct pursued by my Government in international politics, with which all the representatives here are familiar.

24. We believe that the United Nations is an organization for peace, in the sense that its aims and final objectives should be so directed that the great questions which divide East from West may be considered, studied and analysed in an atmosphere of spiritual understanding, not presented and discussed in a manner which makes their solution daily more difficult, nay, impossible. That is the Argentine Government's position.

25. The United Nations may rest assured that any constructive proposal, any effort towards peace and mutual understanding, any factor of positive value to the work of the Organization and to its task of maintaining peace will receive our support. Similarly, it may rest assured that any proposal that is calculated to divide yet further the parties in dispute, thus representing a negative factor in relation to the aims which should be pursued by the United Nations, will receive no support from us. This is, we believe, a proper attitude and we are resolutely maintaining it because it is a faithful expression of the views of the Argentine people, who long for world peace, and because, too, it is the thought of all peoples, for they can desire only peace.

26. In concluding, I should like to make it quite clear that the Argentine vote, based as it is solely on the foregoing considerations, in no way implies any judgment on the question of intervention in the domestic affairs of a State which has been raised by some representatives. My Government has been, is and will continue to be among the most faithful, firm and constant proponents of the principle of non-intervention.

27. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland): The proposal of Czechoslovakia concerning the interference of the United States in the internal affairs of other States, as manifested by United States Public Law No. 165, deals with one of the aspects of the present international situation. The problem, however, with which the Czechoslovak draft resolution deals extends far beyond the framework of the effects of that public law in the countries against which it is immediately directed. This is so because the policy of intervention in the internal affairs of other States is not only harmful to the interests of a number of States which are Members of the United Nations, but is also detrimental to peaceful relations and collaboration among all nations.

28. The delegation of Poland, like several other delegations, presented to the First Committee a number of incontestable proofs showing the criminal character of the law itself and demonstrating that the Government of the United States was supporting and organizing subversion, espionage and sabotage in the USSR, in

China and in the peoples' democracies, thereby aiming at the overthrow of the existing governments and at a change in the existing political and economic systems in those countries.

29. In the discussion in the First Committee, we proved that this public law was not intended to aid refugees, as has been claimed by the United States representative, but, on the contrary, that the Mutual Security Act, and in particular its paragraph 101(a), officially supported, sponsored, organized, financed and propagated activities directed against the interests of other States, including Poland. Speaking before the First Committee, we brought forth concrete and precise data, listed places and names, described ways and means, and even produced exact figures as to the sums which were being used on the basis of the aforementioned law for activities on the territory of Poland. We also showed that this action had met with the unanimous resistance of the Polish people and that it was condemned by everyone in Poland.

30. Although he took the floor several times during the debate, the representative of the United States did not even attempt to refute the facts we had adduced, and he was unable to break down our argumentation. He found his only escape in flimsy excuses, fairy tales and abuse such as we have heard today. This abuse was fully answered in the Committee, and we refuse at the present stage to discuss it again.

31. Objectively, therefore, any member of the Committee has to admit that the case which we submitted has been proved, and consequently the United Nations cannot remain indifferent to such obvious breaches of the basic principles of the Charter.

32. In supporting the Czechoslovak draft resolution today, the Polish delegation wishes to emphasize that it is voting for it with a deep conviction that it embodies the only conclusion that can justly be reached in the case which has been submitted to the United Nations. We are voting for this draft resolution because, in addition to working towards peaceful collaboration among nations, it aims at the removal of intervention in the internal affairs of other States, which constitutes a

major obstacle to international co-operation. By fighting against such intervention in the United Nations, the Polish delegation is staunchly defending the principles of the Charter and, in particular, Articles 1 and 2, which guarantee the peaceful development of all States and which bar all tendencies towards the supremacy of one State over other States.

33. The foreign policy of the People's Republic of Poland has been based, from its very inception, on the principle of the possibility of peaceful co-existence and collaboration of all States, irrespective of their political, economic and social structures. This conception of our foreign policy, and our deep conviction that it is possible to have peaceful co-operation among all nations, have found their expression in deeds through our whole international activity in the political and economic fields, both in our relations with other States and in the United Nations itself.

34. We reject the theory that war is inevitable. We believe that peace can be maintained and that concrete possibilities exist for removing and solving all existing international problems by means of peaceful negotiations. In rising today in support of the Czechoslovak resolution, and in voting for it, we express our belief that it gives to all Members of our Organization, among them in United States, the possibility of manifesting, in acts and deeds, their endorsement of the general desire for peace and their readiness to contribute to the easing of international tensions.

35. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the Czechoslovak draft resolution [A/L.148].

The draft resolution was rejected by 40 votes to 5, with 14 abstentions.

Third report of the Credentials Committee (A/2374)

[Agenda item 3]

The draft resolution contained in the report was adopted without discussion.

The meeting rose at 3.50 p.m.