



Wednesday, 2 December 1953,
at 3 p.m.

New York

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Question of atrocities committed by the North Korean and Chinese communist forces against United Nations prisoners of war in Korea (<i>continued</i>)	403

President: Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi PANDIT (India).

Question of atrocities committed by the North Korean and Chinese communist forces against United Nations prisoners of war in Korea (*continued*)

[Agenda item 74]

1. Mr. KISELYOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The question now before the General Assembly of atrocities allegedly committed by the North Korean and Chinese forces against the so-called United Nations prisoners of war in Korea clearly indicates the extent to which slander, falsification and fabrication have been resorted to by those who would stop at nothing to create an atmosphere of anxiety and fear, of hatred and threats, in order to increase the existing international tension and to obstruct the pacific settlement of the most important international problems, and more especially the Korean question. The utterly mendacious and falsified data submitted to the General Assembly by the United States delegation have no connexion with the real facts. It is not by chance that this notorious question has been foisted on the General Assembly at a time when the fate of the political conference on Korea, which is to lead to the peaceful settlement of the whole Korean problem, hangs in the balance. The facts show that reactionary circles in the United States are stopping at nothing in their efforts to obstruct and frustrate a successful settlement of the Korean question.

2. As one of their methods, they have chosen a campaign of discrediting the armed forces of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea and the Chinese People's Volunteers by airing fabricated and wholly unsubstantiated charges that those armed forces are guilty of murdering United States prisoners of war. It is important to note that this is not the first attempt of the kind that the United States Command has made. Such false charges have repeatedly been exposed to world public opinion.

3. In his statement on 30 November 1953 [462nd meeting], the United States representative, Mr. Lodge, tried to paint a picture of certain mythical atrocities committed against United States prisoners of war, which actually were not and could not have been committed. In support of his false charges, Mr. Lodge referred to the historical report of the War Crimes Division and to document A/2563 of 26 November

1953, which has been distributed to representatives in the General Assembly. It is characteristic of Mr. Lodge's statement and of the documents he cited that they are unsubstantiated and tendentious and slander the military command of the Chinese People's Volunteers and the Korean People's Army.

4. A close study of the documents submitted by Mr. Lodge shows up the facts and figures adduced therein as so incredible and unfounded that it is obvious that this whole scheme and this literary concoction were intended to deceive the naive and to mislead, first of all, the American people, and then the peoples of the world. The authors of these documents apparently follow the well-known fascist formula that small lies are useless; lies must be big to be believed.

5. The documents frequently refer to United States investigators and the notorious South Korean police, who were instructed to investigate fictitious cases of atrocities against United States prisoners of war. In their descriptions of the evidence and in their conclusions, these investigators and the Syngman Rhee police piled up one monstrous fabrication on another, guided throughout by the instructions issued to them by their superiors. Their descriptions contain not the slightest suggestion of any legal grounds, expert medical opinion or any other documentary or material evidence which might convince anyone of a particular person's guilt. These so-called investigators did not even scruple to allege that the bodies of slain Chinese and North Korean prisoners of war and of civilian victims of the American bombings were the bodies of United States soldiers shot by North Korean soldiers and Chinese volunteers. In photographing these bodies, they tried to conceal the identity of the corpses. In fact, even a professional criminologist would find it difficult to determine whether the bodies are those of United States soldiers or of North Korean prisoners of war and Chinese volunteers who were shot.

6. We know from American Press reports that, during the withdrawal of the United States and Syngman Rhee troops, thousands of prisoners were taken from their gaols into the hills or gullies and were there shot and buried in common graves. During hasty retreats, prisoners were often shot in prison yards or nearby and were buried in common graves. It is now easy for the American and Syngman Rhee investigators to open these graves, take out the corpses of Koreans shot by the United States and Syngman Rhee troops and present them as proof of atrocities against American prisoners of war and South Korean nationals. It is also known that United States aircraft repeatedly bombed North Korean hospitals, in spite of the Red Cross flag flown on those buildings. United States aircraft even bombed camps where American prisoners of war were held. The United States and Syngman Rhee investigators are now trying to use the graves

of persons killed by American bombs for their nefarious ends.

7. In his statement, Mr. Lodge cited various fabrications from document A/2563, passing them off as facts. It is noteworthy, however, that Mr. Lodge carefully refrained from talking about all those parts of the report which exposed the utter falsehood of those so-called facts. For example, Mr. Lodge ignored the many statements by repatriated American prisoners of war contained in that document to the effect that they had been treated humanely by the Korean and Chinese authorities, that they had received the same food as the Korean and Chinese troops, and that they had received proper medical care. These facts do not suit the United States representative, and he therefore ignored them.

8. Mr. Lodge further alleged that Soviet officers were in charge of prisoner-of-war camps in North Korea. This bare-faced slander has often been refuted by the Soviet representatives. Mr. Lodge's words were vain, for he did not adduce a single scrap of evidence in support of his slanderous assertions, and indeed could not do so, since there is no such evidence and there never has been.

9. The Turkish representative, Mr. Sarper, stated [462nd meeting] that the North Koreans and Chinese had killed 166 Turkish officers and men. That is a calumny. In order to create a semblance of credibility, Mr. Sarper cited a number of cases of alleged murders. But the Turkish representative's sorry attempt to slander the North Korean People's Army and the Chinese People's Volunteers failed completely when it came to the point of producing real proof of his slanderous fabrications. Mr. Sarper had and could have no proof. In coming forward here with his slander, Mr. Sarper was merely carrying out the wishes of his masters overseas.

10. The representative of Australia, Sir Percy Spender, in the speech he made yesterday [463rd meeting], maliciously slandered the heroic Korean People's Army and the Chinese People's Volunteers, accusing them of committing atrocities against American prisoners of war and civilians in South Korea. He went so far in his insolent slander as to try to accuse the USSR representative, Mr. Vyshinsky, of war propaganda. He tried unsuccessfully to refute the arguments adduced by Mr. Vyshinsky [463rd meeting] to show that the United States charges were false. He praised Mr. Lodge's statement and the documents Mr. Lodge had submitted to the General Assembly. He tried to defend and popularize the facts set out in those documents. He even made the slanderous allegation that the North Korean soldiers used the corpses of American prisoners of war for bayonet practice.

11. The representatives of the USSR, Poland, Czechoslovakia and the Ukrainian SSR have already exposed the slanderous nature of the falsifications submitted to the General Assembly by the United States delegation.

12. I have already pointed out that these falsifications were submitted with the object of slandering the heroic warriors of the Korean People's Army and the Chinese People's Volunteers, who were defending their country against the invasion of foreign interventionists. This campaign of lies and slander is also designed to

deceive the world and to divert attention from the preparations for a new world war which are in fact being made by reactionary circles in the United States.

13. An illustration of what I have just said is to be found in a United Press report of 1 December 1953, stating that on Wednesday, 2 December 1953, a special Senate investigating sub-committee would begin a public hearing of certain witnesses on the question of atrocities in Korea. The meetings of the sub-committee are to take place three times a week, and it is noted in the report that arrangements are being made to televise the proceedings. This report shows that the ruling circles in the United States are bent on further expanding this campaign of slander with the object of deceiving the American people. There can be no doubt that this campaign of malicious slander will burst like a soap bubble and that the real truth, namely, that no atrocities have been or are being committed by the North Korean armed forces and the Chinese People's Volunteers, will finally prevail.

14. The Australian representative expatiated here on the need for the observance and implementation of international conventions. This is a justifiable demand, but I should like to ask Sir Percy Spender why he did not call for the observance of the Geneva Conventions of 1929 and 1949 at the time when the United States and Syngman Rhee troops were carrying out mass shootings of North Korean and Chinese prisoners of war in the camps on the islands of Koje and Pongam, in Pusan and in other places. He did not protest against those atrocities and shootings because he was himself indirectly party to them.

15. The New Zealand representative, Mr. Munro, said [464th meeting] that the photographs published at the end of the so called historical report served as proof of the communist atrocities. Mr. Munro adduced no other proof. He did not even trouble to reflect that in war-time it is possible to take all kinds of photographs of corpses; enough of them may be found buried in graves, clothed in all kinds of ways and lying in all kinds of positions. War is war. Anyone who needs a subject for a photograph can tie a corpse's hands behind its back with wire. In examining these photographs, Mr. Munro should have noticed the faces of the corpses, which were blurred with some kind of ink. The authors of the report explained that this was done to prevent relatives from recognizing the bodies. I think that it was done so as better to conceal the fakes.

16. The New Zealand representative went so far in his malicious slander as to compare the atrocities committed by Genghis Khan and Tamerlane with the American-invented atrocities alleged to have been committed by the Korean People's Army and the Chinese People's Volunteers. Such a comparison and such terminology are unworthy of a Member of the United Nations. The heroic North Korean people and the great Chinese people will contemptuously reject this malicious slander by Mr. Munro, who, I firmly believe, does not reflect the views of the people of New Zealand.

17. The so-called report on atrocities prepared by the United States military authorities, which includes the historical report of the War Crimes Division, provides further convincing proof that all the charges against the People's Republic of China and the People's Democratic Republic of Korea are a tissue of lies and were compiled exclusively for the purpose of deceiv-

ing world public opinion. The so-called historical report states that 6,113 must be taken as the "probable" number of American soldiers who were killed or starved or tortured to death as prisoners in Korea. The authors have clearly juggled with figures, showing thereby that the United States authorities have no specific data. Where, indeed, should they have obtained such data, since they do not exist?

18. From a perusal of the document submitted it is abundantly clear that its authors have used the word "probable" to cloak the obviously unconvincing and mendacious nature of their assertions. But it is impossible to base charges on something that has not been proved and which the accusers themselves regard as merely probable. Even the cases which supposedly constitute proof turn out, on examination, to be gross fabrications.

19. The United States delegation says in its report that the military authorities in Korea derived most of their information concerning alleged atrocities from the admissions of captured Korean and Chinese soldiers. It is quite obvious that such so-called proof completely gives away the authors of this whole campaign of lies about atrocities. This false testimony could plainly have been obtained from them only by threats, torture, starvation, ill-treatment or similar methods. The fact that Korean and Chinese prisoners of war were most inhumanely tortured and killed by those same United States military authorities is well known to the whole world, and I shall enlarge on that later.

20. A perusal of the historical report we have before us leads inevitably to the conclusion that the charges are absolutely unproved and obviously fabricated. Here is one of many examples which clearly reveal the false and slanderous nature of the report. In section V, f, mention is made of the slaughter of 1,250 American prisoners. One would normally have expected that detailed data, which would have left no room for doubt, would have been adduced in support of such a serious charge. But there is nothing of the kind. The report states that this may be regarded as true "if the confession of a North Korean prisoner is true". It further states that "that is all the evidence contained in the file." Is this not the most outrageous mockery of the most elementary concepts of evidence in proof of charges? Mention is made of the slaughter of 1,250 prisoners, but not even one piece of evidence worthy of the slightest consideration is adduced. The report states that the testimony of one prisoner gave the interrogators the impression that the charge was "reliable". But I ask you, how can the United Nations be concerned with the subjective impression of a certain American interrogator who extorted a "confession" from one prisoner of war? This is an illustration of the methods and fabrications which fill the report of the United States Command.

21. Let us look at another case, listed in the report as case No. 180. There it is stated that a junior lieutenant of a North Korean Political Security Police unit shot six political prisoners without trial. The report, however, goes on to say that five of these six "survived", so that only one person was killed. How can this provocative invention be regarded as anything but a crude and ridiculous fabrication? There is a Russian saying which is apposite in this connexion: "Lie if you must, but don't overdo it." I must say that there is no dearth of lies in the report.

22. I should like, now, to consider the report of 26 November 1953 [A/2563]. In the letter from Mr. Roger Kyes, the United States Deputy Secretary of Defense, it is stated that the War Crimes Division of the United States Army prepared a report covering 1,615 atrocity cases allegedly committed by the Communists in Korea. The letter also states that extensive portions of the report were released on 28 October 1953. The contents of the report were so absurd, contradictory and unconvincing, that the authors themselves decided to submit descriptions of only eight of the 1,615 cases allegedly available to them. The very fact that only one two-hundredth part of the evidence the authors wished to present is published bears witness to their own lack of confidence in their proofs of the atrocities allegedly committed by the armed forces of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea and the Chinese People's Volunteers.

23. Let us dwell on the descriptions of a few of these eight cases, submitted in support of the shaky position of the United States in document A/2563. In confirmation of the fiction presented in the opening paragraphs of case No. 67, the authors refer to an "admission" by a North Korean sergeant. But they contradict themselves in the same paragraph, by stating that "close examination of the evidence leaves some doubt as to whether this case was properly referred". The authors of this compendium of falsifications, describing a shooting alleged to have taken place on 13 October 1950, use absolutely contradictory testimony by "witnesses".

24. In the affidavit of Lieutenant Makarounis, given in case No. 75, a number of facts are adduced which, far from confirming, actually refute the charges brought against the North Koreans and Chinese. Asked whether he had ever been beaten or mistreated by the North Korean Army, Makarounis replied in the negative. To another question, whether he had at any time seen North Koreans kill any United Nations prisoners of war, including South Koreans, Makarounis said that he had not personally seen any. When asked whether he had witnessed any other acts of mistreatment of United Nations prisoners of war, he replied that he himself had never witnessed such acts, but had been told of them by men who had seen them. Makarounis was asked how many of the group of which he was a part died from any causes, and whether any had died in the march from Hadong to Seoul. He replied that he could not recall that anyone had died in the march from Hadong to Seoul. In the march from Seoul to Pyongyang, they had started with approximately 376 American prisoners of war, and when they arrived at Pyongyang there were approximately 296 left. Makarounis' statement makes it obvious that the prisoners of war who perished were killed as the result of raids by United States aircraft. It is legitimate to ask why the alleged atrocities should be attributed to the North Koreans and Chinese, when United States aircraft, as Makarounis admits, were strafing American prisoners of war; now the blame is laid on the North Koreans and Chinese. This fact speaks for itself.

25. There is a great body of irrefutable evidence which gives the lie to the assertions of the United States authorities. This evidence includes statements by officers and men of the United Nations armed forces who have returned from captivity, reports in the world Press and, more particularly, the United States Press,

statements by United States Government officials, and statements by the Governments of the People's Republic of China and the People's Democratic Republic of Korea. I should like to quote some of this evidence.

26. Officers and men of the United Nations armed forces who have returned from captivity refute the assertions of the American propagandists. On 2 May 1953, for example, the correspondent of the London *Times* reported that Corporal Hunt of the Gloucesters protested against some hardship stories that had already been published. Hunt said: "The truth is that we had very fair treatment indeed."

27. On 2 May 1953, the correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph and Morning Post* reported a statement by Private Serrage of the Eighth Hussars Regiment to the effect that the prisoners had been well treated and had been given exactly the same food as their captors.

28. On 25 April 1953, the Australian newspaper, the *Sydney Morning Herald*, published a Tokyo report of a statement made by five Australian soldiers freed from a Korean prisoner-of-war camp on 23 April. They said that they could not complain that the Communists had treated them badly; they had received the same medical care as wounded Chinese, and Chinese doctors had saved the lives of two of them. I mention this for the information of the Australian representative, Sir Percy Spender.

29. Furthermore, according to an Associated Press report from Winston-Salem, North Carolina, of 21 May 1953, Corporal Pinkston of Jacksonville, on his return to the United States after liberation from captivity in North Korea, stated in an interview that stories about mistreatment of American prisoners of war by the Koreans and Chinese were "just a bunch of lies". Pinkston said that the Chinese had given the prisoners books, adding that they had always responded to the prisoners' suggestions and carried them out whenever possible. He himself had not seen anyone being ill-treated.

30. The humane treatment of prisoners of war by the military authorities of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea is shown by the testimony of a United States soldier, Kenyon Wagner, who was interviewed by an Associated Press correspondent on 20 April 1953. Wagner stated that he had been well treated and that while he was in a North Korean hospital several doctors had given him treatment. Another repatriated prisoner of war, Corporal Jackson, also told of the good treatment of prisoners of war in camps. It was his opinion that the Chinese and North Koreans had done their best, given their stocks of medicines.

31. Thus, even the American Press was compelled to admit that the stories of the mistreatment of United Nations prisoners of war had no connexion with the facts. On 23 April 1953, the *Christian Science Monitor* was obliged to state that no one had any incontrovertible evidence that would support any serious charges.

32. On 24 April 1953, the Korean correspondent of the conservative newspaper, the *Daily Mirror*, wrote as follows: "Beware of exaggerated horror stories attributed to Allied soldiers freed in Korea. Some of those circulating in the United States and probably beyond are bunk . . . I have been compelled to doubt the accuracy of horror stories told by two Americans because these contained contradictions."

33. According to a report by the Associated Press Washington correspondent of 14 August 1953, Mr. Stevens, the United States Secretary of the Army, stated at a Press interview on his return from a visit to Korea that the physical condition of the American prisoners of war repatriated from North Korea was amazingly good. Such statements in the world Press, confirmed by the United States Secretary of the Army himself, completely refute the vicious slander of the American propagandists.

34. All these facts prove that the troops of the Korean People's Army and the Chinese volunteers treated United Nations prisoners of war humanely, in full compliance with the provisions of the 1949 Geneva Convention.

35. In contrast to this, the American aggressors and their Syngman Rhee henchmen used the most cruel and inhuman methods of warfare in Korea. United States aircraft mercilessly bombed peaceful Korean towns and villages, using such a barbarous weapon as napalm. Whole Korean towns were wiped from the face of the earth, hundreds of thousands of defenceless civilians perished, and priceless historical monuments of Korean culture were mercilessly destroyed. As long ago as 22 March 1952, General MacArthur, of whom you may have heard, cynically made the following statement:

"We enforced upon the Korean people [a] dreadful tragedy. As a consequence, death has come to hundreds of thousands of defenceless Korean civilians, and a nation . . . has been devastated and gutted."

Military intervention in the territory of Korea became an instrument for the mass extermination of the Korean people. The fact that mass murders of the Korean civilian population began literally at the outset of the Korean war and continued on an ever-increasing scale throughout that war, which lasted for over three years, indicates that this criminal policy of exterminating people was planned in advance by the United States Command.

36. On 8 December 1950, the Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea said in a statement that the American aggressors had inherited from their predecessors in aggression the theory of total destructive war and were applying it with no less savagery and hatred of man. They were waging war not only and not even mainly against armed forces but, first and foremost, against the civilian population.

37. Throughout the Korean war, the American Press time and time again cited evidence of the mass extermination of the civilian population of Korea by United States armed forces. On 9 February 1951, *The New York Times* published a report by Lindesay Parrott, its correspondent in Korea, who used the case of one village to illustrate the United States policy of exterminating the civilian population of Korea. Parrott stated that he was accompanying a tank column which was proceeding towards Seoul. It had, he said, entered a small village north of Anyang, which would go down in history as a ghastly offering to modern totalitarian war; in the village the dead had not been buried because there was no one to bury them.

38. A little later, on 24 February 1951, a *Washington Post* editorial observed that military operations were still as somber as ever: killings, killings and yet more killings. Without any indication of the objectives for

which the war was being fought, villages were being destroyed and soldiers and civilians killed indiscriminately. It had surely been realized that the war was turning into sheer barbarism. The editorial concluded that Americans should reflect how that would affect them, not to mention the Koreans. Thus, a prominent American newspaper, which certainly cannot be suspected of communist propaganda, admitted that the murder of defenceless Korean citizens by Americans was barbarism. World public opinion as a whole was outraged by the crimes committed by the United States Command against the civilian population of Korea.

39. On 29 June 1953, the American magazine *Time* stated that 400,000 Korean citizens had been killed, including women, children and old people, and that 500,000 houses had been completely destroyed. In North Korea, 40 per cent of all inhabited localities had been destroyed.

40. A detailed enumeration of the crimes committed by the American interventionists in Korea in the early months of the war was given in statements made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea on 6 January and 10 February 1951. The enumeration was supplemented in the protest made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea on 29 June 1951. These documents adduce evidence exposing the criminal atrocities committed by the United States Command against the civilian population of Korea.

41. I should like to refer to the book, *Korean Tales*, by Lieutenant Colonel Voorhees of the United States Army, which was published at the end of 1952. The book cites facts showing that atrocities were committed by the United States soldiery in Korea. On pages 45 to 47, there is a description of a flight made by an American reporter in a United States Air Force jet plane in Korea, during which the pilot ruthlessly strafed and bombed Korean civilians. On pages 76 to 79, there is a story of a United States sergeant in Korea who with his own hands machine-gunned a group of Chinese prisoners of war. On pages 149 and 150, there is the text of a memorandum to all troops from Headquarters, Eighth United States Army in Korea, entitled "How to Alienate Friends and Eliminate People", a message which graphically describes the rowdy behaviour of the troops in Korea. I have cited this book to show how an American colonel describes the atrocities committed by the United States Command against the civilian population and prisoners of war. It is difficult for Mr. Lodge to refute these facts. I would recommend that he read the book carefully.

42. A large number of peaceful Korean citizens perished in the barbarous bombing raids carried out by the United States Air Force. Much information concerning these monstrous bombings, which caused the death of a great part of the Korean civilian population, is contained in the report released on 23 February 1953 by the Commission of the Central Committee of the United Democratic Fatherland Front of Korea for investigating the atrocities and determining the damage wrought by the United States aggressors and the Syngman Rhee clique. In flagrant disregard of the generally accepted standards of treatment of prisoners of war laid down in the 1949 Geneva Convention, United States troops carried out hundreds of brutal reprisals

against defenceless North Korean and Chinese prisoners of war. The criminal acts of the United States soldiery took the form of systematic slaughter by the United States Command in Korea of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war held in United States camps.

43. On 8 August 1953, the *Sinhwa* agency correspondent reported from Kaesong that, according to official United States data, from the beginning of the United States aggression in Korea to 24 July 1953, 8,418 North Korean and Chinese prisoners of war died in the prisoner-of-war camps under the control of the United Nations Command.

44. All over the world, the Press has written openly of the endless series of crimes committed by the United States military authorities. Even United States newspapers, which serve the ruling circles in the United States, have been unable to cover the traces of the atrocities committed by United States forces against North Korean and Chinese prisoners of war. All these irrefutable facts, many more of which could be cited, bear witness to the manifold crimes committed by the United States military authorities, crimes which include the torture and massacre of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war in the United States camps, which have rightly earned the name of death camps. No amount of slander about the activities of the Korean People's Army and the army of the Chinese People's Volunteers can enable the United States Command to conceal its illegal and barbarous deeds and terroristic acts in the prisoner-of-war camps. The truth is, therefore, that it was not the North Korean and Chinese side which ill-treated prisoners of war, but the so-called United Nations Command which bear the responsibility for the murder of thousands of North Korean and Chinese prisoners.

45. The report before us concerning atrocities allegedly committed against United States prisoners of war is fabricated and false from beginning to end. It must be admitted that the attempt to slander the armed forces of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea and the People's Republic of China has failed completely. There can be no doubt that certain persons will eventually be obliged to admit the universally-known truth that intrigue and slander perish, but that facts remain and the truth must triumph.

46. For all these reasons, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR considers that the draft resolution [A/L.169] submitted by five delegations headed by the United States is unacceptable, since it is intended further to aggravate the international situation.

47. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): Although the statement by the representative of the Soviet Union [463rd meeting] was long, its points—if that is what they should be called—were really few and can be disposed of briefly.

48. First, the Soviet representative took exception to the fact that, in my presentation, I did not mention the casualties inflicted by the United States Air Force in Korea. I did not talk about any casualties that were inflicted in the normal course of war. I did not mention the casualties inflicted by the United States Air Force—or by the Chinese artillery, which was using shells and guns that came from the Soviet Union in fighting the troops of the United Nations. Nor did I speak of the casualties inflicted by the Chinese infantry, with its weapons and other equipment, much of which was supplied by the Soviet Union and which was used in an

attempt to destroy the troops of the United Nations. I thought it was understood here that war was a terrible thing and that the purpose of the United Nations was to prevent war. We are not, today, however, dealing with normal battle casualties: today, we are dealing with atrocities.

49. Towards the end of his statement, the Soviet representative discussed the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, of repulsive memory. While I unquestionably could have raised a point of order and prevented those remarks from being made—remarks which so obviously had nothing to do with the pending question—it seemed better not to do so and to find out what the Soviet representative would say. My curiosity was rewarded. When the Soviet representative actually said that it was the United States which had started Hitler off, I felt that we had reached a new level of absurdity. Certainly, if the Soviet representative can persuade the peoples of the world that the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt collaborated with Hitler, he will be far cleverer than the man who sold refrigerators to the Eskimos.

50. There was one statement in the speech which we can all endorse—and that is the tribute to the way in which the Soviet Army fought against the hitlerite forces in the Second World War. I myself have in the past referred to the way in which 150 Soviet divisions attacked on the eastern front, when the Allied armies in the west were in a difficult situation, in December 1944 and January 1945. We honour their services and their heroism. We also honour the men who fought so bravely at Stalingrad. It is simply because we do honour them that we are amazed at the way in which the Soviet authorities today have clutched Field Marshal von Paulus to their collective bosom, in view of the fact that Field Marshal von Paulus was the nazi general who commanded the nazi army group which sought to destroy Stalingrad. Apparently the idea in the ruling circles of the Soviet Union today is to reward your enemies and punish your friends.

51. Then, the Soviet representative indulged in what we in this country call "lawyering", which means playing games with the technicalities of court procedure without getting at the heart of a matter. In one instance he complained that there actually were not enough witnesses, and in another instance he complained because—to use his own words—whenever there was a massacre, there miraculously were survivors who could give testimony of these alleged atrocities. To follow that reasoning to its logical conclusion, the only way in which we could have real proof of guilt would be for all the witnesses to be dead.

52. The fact is that what we face today is not a legalistic question to be handled with the technique of the courtroom, but an intensely human question which should be dealt with on a human basis.

53. And, incidentally, we have an affidavit from Chong Myong Tok, and it is available to anyone who wishes to see it. The Soviet representative had some questions about that. The affidavit was not included in the compilation because it was repetitious and cumulative and did not add to or substract anything from what had already been said by Kim Kwong Taek.

54. The Soviet representative referred to the communist riots in the prison camps, beginning at Kojé in December 1951. These were all instigated by the com-

munist high command for the deliberate purpose of putting the United Nations Command in the worst possible light while the armistice talks were proceeding. There was an elaborate command system inside and outside the prison compounds—a system such as never was seen in the Second World War, or any other war. Inside the compounds, through terroristic methods, thousands of innocent prisoners were organized to commit mass acts of violence, in which some of those prisoners lost their lives—a matter of complete indifference to the communist authorities, who, of course, regard man as a mere pawn of the State and think that a man's life is well destroyed in the interest of so-called grand strategy.

55. Who was the master mind of that operation? It was none other than General Nam Il of the Korean Army. And who is General Nam Il? He is a former Soviet army officer and a Soviet citizen who, at the very moment in question, was the chief delegate conducting the armistice talks. The same General Nam Il was directing the killings at Kojé, at the very time when he was issuing loud and sanctimonious protests at Panmunjom. This must set some kind of record for international double-talk and double-dealing.

56. Another individual who was also at Panmunjom, disguised as a lieutenant or a sergeant, was General Kim Pa, a former agent of the Soviet MVD [*Ministry of the Interior*], who, among other duties, had the post of recruiting infiltration agents to carry instructions from Panmunjom into the prison camps.

57. This is all considered terribly clever politics by those men in the seats of the mighty who are making of communism the most hated word in human speech and who, in the spirit of the most total reaction, are seeking to enslave mankind as it has never before been enslaved.

58. So far as our management of prison camps is concerned, we point out that we welcomed the International Committee of the Red Cross and gave it every facility to come to our camps, to see for itself and to say what it did not like and what it did like. Until after the armistice, the International Committee of the Red Cross never had access to any communist prisons, either in North Korea or in China. Everything that went on there was secret. The result is that the story which we are submitting today comes from returning prisoners and similar sources.

59. That is why I ask the Soviet representative today whether, as the spokesman of his Government, he will give his support—and also secure the acceptance of the Chinese and North Korean régimes—to a proposal to constitute a committee of the International Red Cross as a commission of inquiry to investigate the facts underlying these atrocity charges.

60. The Soviet representative criticized the methods which we used to investigate these charges of atrocities. He said that our documentation was bosh. In that case he should be glad to give the International Committee of the Red Cross the right to travel freely throughout Korea and the Chinese mainland, as it may deem necessary, in the performance of its task, with freedom of access to such persons, places and relevant documents as it considers necessary for the fulfilment of its task, and to examine any witnesses under such safeguards and conditions as the committee shall determine, and to report its findings to the General Assembly. The Red Cross is a body international in character, re-

nowned for its objectivity, and respected everywhere. Let it judge these facts. This is a real test of good faith.

61. This is all, really; that needs to be said concerning the speech of the Soviet representative. Apparently, on the Hitler theory that the more fantastic the untruth the more readily will it be believed, he dismissed the whole tragic saga with the statement that it was an American forgery—a monstrous frame-up intended, to use his own words, to be the “dynamite to blow up the peace negotiations in Korea”. That is not my rhetoric: it is quoted.

62. He did not say why we should want to blow up the peace negotiations in Korea, and of course he could not give one single reason. In fact, all the reasons—and there are reasons of the most poignant and deeply gripping character—are the other way. We have half a million of our young men in Korea. That furnishes the strongest possible motive that any country could possibly have to establish a lasting peace in that country. The leaders of the Soviet Union, who, apparently, were willing to fight the Korean war right down to the last Chinese, are the ones who thought they had an interest in keeping the war going. We have demonstrated time and again in this Assembly, among other places, how single-minded is the United States desire to get a peace in Korea; as a matter of fact, I think that there are some representatives who think we are a little too single-minded about it.

63. This morning a man gave me an old Russian proverb, and he said that the Soviet representative would probably remember it. It was: “You can make your way around the world by a lie, but you cannot retrace your steps by it”. You cannot return by a lie. We see the truth of this proverb in the attitude of the communist prisoners who do not wish to return because they would be returning by a lie.

64. The Soviet representative refuses to be guided by facts and by reason and by human compassion. Normally speaking, it could be expected that he would deplore these atrocities as much as we do, but he proceeds on the basis of doctrine. He proceeds on the basis of what is considered to be clever communist tactics as they have traditionally evolved in the last fifty or sixty years. There apparently is a standard communist pose, a standard communist attitude which must be applied in every situation rigidly, like the bed of Procrustes. But the situation we confront here today is not a standard situation. It is tragic, it is atrocious; it is as tragic and as atrocious as the atrocities of the Second World War. Let us, in this Assembly, show the world how deeply we detest these dreadful deeds.

65. Mr. NASZKOWSKI (Poland) (*translated from French*): During the debate on the question of the alleged atrocities committed by the North Koreans and the Chinese People's Volunteers, some delegations have seen fit to aid the United States delegation by supporting and confirming the fabrications set forth in that delegation's report to the General Assembly, which is nothing but a falsification of history.

66. I should like to reply briefly to the French representative who, yesterday [464th meeting], posed as the defender of the Polish people and endeavoured to distort the well-known events leading up to Hitler's attack on Poland in 1939. Sir Gladwyn Jebb and Mr. Lodge have today repeated those assertions.

67. I should like to reassure the French representative. The Polish people remembers the events which preceded the Second World War and the part played by the ruling circles of the western countries too well to be hoodwinked by the real intentions behind such statements. The Polish people remembers full well that those circles were on Hitler's side in their Munich policy, and delivered first Czechoslovakia and then Poland into his clutches. We have not forgotten the Munich slogan of that time: “Danzig and Poland are not worth dying for.” We remember full well the “phoney war” of 1939. The French guns were silent and British aircraft remained grounded while Hitler's forces occupied Poland's entire territory. The French forces remained behind their Maginot Line, leaving the bulk of the Hitler armies free to fight on the Polish front.

68. We know, too, why the United Kingdom and French Governments acted in that way despite the alliances which bound them to Poland. By adopting those tactics, they sought to launch Hitler against the Soviet Union, the country which six years later was to liberate many European countries and which made a massive contribution to France's liberation from the yoke of hitlerism. Hence the representative of the French Government, which pursues to this day its fatal policy of reviving Hitler's war might against the interests of the French people, is perhaps in the worst possible position to pose as the defender of Poland.

69. The Polish Government, animated by friendly feelings towards the French people, expressed to the French Government in its note of 19 November 1953 its disquiet at the rebirth, under the auspices of the western States, of German militarism, which is a menace to the security of both Poland and France.

70. As to the German-Soviet Pact of 1939, the Polish people well knows that that agreement, concluded at a time when Poland's fate had already been decided by the western Powers' betrayal, was just and far-sighted. It delayed Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union, enabling the latter to bring its forces up to strength and thus contributing to the eventual Soviet victory over fascism to which Poland owed its freedom. Those who today distort history under cover of defending Poland persist—as the French representative did yesterday and as Sir Gladwyn Jebb, the United Kingdom representative, has done today—in ignoring the fact that, before concluding the German-Soviet Pact, the Soviet Union had made every effort to establish in Europe a stable system of collective security to prevent hitlerite aggression. The western States, however, made it impossible to establish such a system. At the same time, the Soviet Union offered Poland its military aid, and repeated that offer on the eve of the war; but the reactionary Smigly-Rydz ruling circles, who were traitors to their country and under the western government's influence, spurned the Soviet Union's aid.

71. Those are the facts. In view of what I have just said, I emphatically affirm that the forces which desire to see Poland weak and defenceless again today will not succeed in loosening the indissoluble ties of friendship which bind the Polish people to the Soviet people. That friendship is not only Poland's guarantee of independence; to an equally great degree it contributes to the cause of peace in Europe.

72. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I am speaking

under rule 74 of the rules of procedure and have no intention of reverting to the discussion of the question which has engaged us continuously up till now or of going over the same ground again. That is my first observation.

73. My second is that I make it a firm rule and principle never to pick quarrels or to engage in discussions or disputes on matters on which controversy could be avoided, especially when such matters are completely irrelevant to the question at issue.

74. Mr. Lodge professed astonishment that I should have seen fit to refer to the Soviet-German Pact of 1939. The obvious rejoinder is to remind him that it was he himself who raised the question here. In his speech of 30 November [461st meeting], he brought accusations which I duly analysed at the time and which naturally forced me to set out the real state of affairs existing in 1939. So if Mr. Lodge objects to my having referred to the matter, he has only himself to blame. It was he who broached it. His witnesses have been sufficiently discredited here already, and his attempt to save the day by dragging in Eskimos and refrigerators is a witticism which is hardly likely to help in establishing the truth or in refuting the facts I adduced in my admittedly somewhat lengthy statement.

75. Mr. Lodge is still giving the impression that he does not understand what actually happened in 1939. For instance, he even upbraided me for accusing Roosevelt of friendship with Hitler. But that is not so; we could never accuse Roosevelt of friendship with Hitler because that would not correspond to the true facts or to the whole trend of the foreign policy of the United States at that time. But certain other members of the ruling circles in the United States Government or, at any rate, persons closely related to them—like Mr. Allan Dulles, for example—and the representatives of quite a number of United States monopolies, could unquestionably be accused of such friendship at that time.

76. I might, for example, have said—and I did in fact refer to it—that from the very moment it came to power the nazi government sought to revive German militarism and the German war machine. To that end, Germany's primary need was to provide itself with the latest weapons of war. In order to do that, it first had to restore and develop its heavy industry, especially in the Ruhr, that arsenal of German and Prussian militarism, which was inherited and expanded by Hitler, who built up a really powerful war machine.

77. Who helped him in that endeavour, I might have asked? If Mr. Lodge is not well-informed about such matters—and this would be quite natural, because altogether he shows little knowledge of the subjects he tries to discuss here—I could draw his attention to a number of very important facts in this connexion, such as the preponderant role played by American monopolies, headed by the Du Pont, Morgan, Rockefeller and Lamont families and by other American industrial magnates in financing German heavy industry and in instituting and extending very close relations between American and German industry. I might mention banks and concerns like Du Pont de Nemours, Imperial Chemical Industries, I. G. Farben Industries, and many similar organizations which rained a golden shower of United States dollars on Germany's war industry in order to help Hitler to create the mighty

war machine which he later set in motion at the time of the Second World War.

78. These are facts which cannot be got round by any quips about Eskimos or even about refrigerators. They are quite inescapable.

79. If I wanted to comment on the line taken by United States foreign policy in the matter at that time, I might mention that the former President of the United States, Mr. Truman—at that time he was of course only a member of the United States Senate—said the day after Germany's attack on the Soviet Union that, if Germany seemed to be winning, the United States should help the Soviet Union, but, if the Soviet Union was winning, it should help Germany, so that they could finish each other off as completely as possible.

80. As Sir Gladwyn Jebb, who is also present here today, will remember, a similar statement was made by the then British Minister of Aircraft Production, Colonel Moore-Brabazon, who said that, for the United Kingdom, the best outcome of the war on the eastern front would be the mutual exhaustion of Germany and the Soviet Union, which would leave the United Kingdom in a commanding position in Europe. I ask you, did Colonel Moore-Brabazon make that statement or not? He did. Let members of the United Kingdom delegation come forward here and deny that such a statement was ever made.

81. Any account of the real state of international relations in 1939 would be incomplete without a reference to the statement made by Mr. Winston Churchill, then Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, on 22 June 1941, the date on which the Nazis attacked us. He said:

"The Russian danger is therefore our danger and the danger of the United States just as the cause of any Russian fighting for his hearth and home is the cause of free men and free peoples in every quarter of the globe."

82. If Mr. Lodge were interested in literature, he would be aware that a Soviet translation was published of Mr. Churchill's statement, which testified to the fact that, in addition to the Moore-Brabazons, there were perspicacious politicians capable of extending the hand of friendship to the Soviet Union and of accepting the help and collaboration it offered in the war struggle against Hitler. The translation was published in a special pamphlet issued in 1948. That pamphlet noted that the same attitude towards the Soviet Union had been adopted by the Roosevelt administration in the United States. What then was the point of Mr. Lodge's reference to Eskimos in connexion with President Roosevelt, since that was how we regarded President Roosevelt and his policy? There is, then, no reason to profane the memory of that great man for political purposes, by distorting our attitude towards the late President of the United States.

83. Mr. Lodge has alleged that I was "lawyering" without getting to the heart of the matter in my analysis of the documents submitted by his delegation. That is, of course, not the case. From Mr. Lodge's standpoint, my statement was probably unsatisfactory and failed to prove anything, since he looks for evidence acceptable to himself; it is, however, necessary to be objective. I spoke of witnesses who appeared mysteriously and then vanished into the blue. I spoke of contradictions which leapt to the eye. In a word, I did everything

I could to get at the heart of the testimony and of the evidence and proofs, to show that they had no more substance than the short but illuminating statement which Mr. Lodge has just made from this rostrum. He refuted nothing and proved nothing; he contented himself with making assertions, disregarding the need to adduce facts in their support. He went so far as again to repeat the sordid allegations about Soviet officers being in command of Korean armies, about agents of the Soviet MVD, and about General Nam Il, who is described as nothing more nor less than the master mind behind the beating up and murder of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war in the Koje camp.

84. But can one really carry absurdity so far as Mr. Lodge has done? At least one should make an effort to adduce a few facts to confirm such assertions. Mr. Lodge himself—I am fully convinced of this—does not believe the statements he is compelled to make here in taking up the cudgels against us and against other representatives. Evidently he spoke thus only because he was obliged to say something in order to provide some sort of justification for the ridiculous and provocative nonsense regarding the alleged atrocities purportedly committed by the North Koreans and the Chinese People's Volunteers. Did he really think that he was speaking convincingly? In fact he produced absolutely no evidence.

85. Mr. Lodge concluded by proposing that a Red Cross committee should investigate the whole matter. This is, I must say, a somewhat tardy proposal and one which has a very demagogic flavour. It is in fact intended for public consumption. Mr. Lodge is not seriously contemplating any investigation.

86. If the United States Government seriously considered that such an investigation was necessary, why did it not accept the proposals put forward in the Security Council in August and September 1950? Why was it that when we demanded that the Security Council should intervene to put an end to the atrocities which the Americans were committing against the North Koreans and the Chinese People's Volunteers—my colleague, Mr. Malik, spoke quite forcefully at that time—our demand passed unheeded? It was baldly rejected. Why did the United States delegation not propose that a committee of investigation should be set up at the time we requested the censure of such outrages, such cynical mass crimes against peace and humanity, crimes so revolting that they could only have been conceived by the most perverted and criminal mind?

87. If the United States had seriously desired such an investigation, it had dozens of opportunities for proposing that a committee should be set up and an investigation carried out by a genuinely impartial international body. That would have been particularly desirable in view of the statement to which I referred yesterday [463rd meeting] by two International Red Cross representatives who were in Korea. Those delegates confirmed, in reports published in the Press, that terrible atrocities and crimes were being committed in the camps controlled by the so-called United Nations forces, but in reality by the United States.

88. Nothing that Mr. Lodge said here will bear scrutiny. He did not take sufficient time to answer the substance of a single one of the charges I made—charges of falsification, accompanied by proofs, charges of forgery, accompanied by proofs, and charges of

distortion and of inventing nonexistent facts. I brought those charges and I bring them again. Why did not Mr. Lodge take advantage of the rostrum to admit that he was wrong on this or that point, that such a fact did not constitute evidence, but that another did? Why did he refrain from doing this—and not he alone? It should be noted that speakers from the delegations which are the authors and sponsors of the draft resolution [A/L.169] submitted to the Assembly have not bothered to refute or correct in any way the incontestable facts I cited. That is due not to my deserts but to the voice of truth, which should and in fact does triumph.

89. Mr. Lodge referred to a Russian proverb. Neither the United Kingdom nor the United States representatives have much success with Russian proverbs. He said there was a proverb that "you can make your way around the world by a lie, but you cannot retrace your steps by it". No such Russian proverb exists. But there is another one which should be noted by those who like using Russian proverbs, but who quote nonexistent proverbs in doing so. Let them make it a principle to use proverbs that exist. There is a proverb which runs: "A lie has short legs." Such a proverb exists and should be remembered in certain quarters. To say that "a lie has short legs" means that you cannot go very far with it.

90. Let me dwell a moment on Sir Gladwyn Jebb's speech [465th meeting]. Sir Gladwyn Jebb denied the historical fact of the agreement reached in 1939, on the eve of the Second World War, between the rulers of the United Kingdom and nazi Germany.

91. I shall now cite a few facts in that connexion. In a statement published in 1939 in the French paper *Ce Soir*, Mr. Lloyd George sharply criticized those who were then in control of British policy, saying that Mr. Neville Chamberlain, Lord Halifax, and Sir John Simon did not want an agreement with the USSR. That was in fact the case.

92. At the end of May 1939, at the time of the Moscow talks, the United Kingdom and France presented proposals which marked some improvement over their previous proposals for a peaceful settlement of disputes and for collective defence. As before, however, they left a vitally important question open—that of guarantees for the three Baltic republics situated on the Soviet Union's north-western frontier. Without such guarantees, the security of the Soviet Union was in no way assured. During the Moscow talks in May and June 1939—and I say this in part in answer to what the representative of France said here [464th meeting]—the attitude of the British and French representatives was so unyielding that the then Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, Mr. Molotov, expressly informed the British ambassador, Sir William Seeds, and the French chargé d'affaires, Mr. Payart, that the draft agreement on joint resistance to aggression in Europe did not contain a plan for the organization of effective mutual aid between the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and France, and did not even indicate a serious interest on the part of the United Kingdom and French Governments in such a pact with the Soviet Union.

93. The Moscow negotiations were endlessly dragging on, and meanwhile other negotiations were taking place between the United Kingdom and nazi Germany on the one hand and France and nazi Germany on the

other, all behind the Soviet Union's back. Evidence of this was given by the London *Times*, which said at the time that a speedy and decisive alliance with the USSR might put a stop to other negotiations. What negotiations? Why, those which the French Government was then conducting with nazi Germany. By "other negotiations" the *Times* also meant those taking place between the United Kingdom Government and Hitler through Mr. Robert Hudson, then Secretary of the Department of Overseas Trade, and Dr. Helmuth Wohltat, Hitler's economic adviser. Is this not a fact? I should like to ask you this: did such negotiations take place or did they not? Are these facts or are they not? I submit that they are facts and that they speak for themselves.

94. I would also recall a statement made at that period by the British Foreign Secretary, Lord Halifax, who made approaches to the nazi Government, unequivocally proposing various discussions, and this at a time when his subordinates were continuing their negotiations with us in Moscow for the conclusion of a collective defence pact. What, then, did Lord Halifax say? I shall quote from the book *Speeches on foreign policy* by Lord Halifax, Oxford University Press, 1940, page 296. It will be seen that I am doing my best to trace my sources, unlike Mr. Lodge, who, for purposes of slander and provocation, attributed to Joseph Stalin a statement about terror, without giving any indication of the source. I described this at the time as a slander, as a statement which was at variance with the facts, and I say it again, in case Mr. Lodge may perhaps find time to tell us where he found the quotation and when and where Stalin is supposed to have said that "terror is the supreme instrument of any power", i.e., that terror is the instrument of Soviet policy. Where did he find this quotation? Perhaps he will be good enough to tell me the volume and the page.

95. To revert to the views expressed by Lord Halifax, he wrote to Hitler as follows: "In such a new atmosphere we could examine the colonial problem, the problem of raw materials, trade barriers, the issue of *Lebensraum*, etc." Does this not speak for itself and show which way the wind was blowing?

96. In June 1939, the United Kingdom began highly secret negotiations in London with Helmuth Wohltat, Hitler's plenipotentiary, who was responsible for the German four-year plan. As I said before, Mr. Hudson and Mr. Chamberlain's close adviser, Mr. Wilson, took part in the discussions with Wohltat. The subject of these talks was kept secret, but may be gleaned from a memorandum dated 21 July 1939 from the German ambassador in London, Dirksen, which we discovered in the archives of the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs after the capture of Berlin.

97. I could mention many more facts of the same kind. When, for example, people speak of our attitude towards Poland at that time, and attempt to refute our statements regarding those who were in fact counting on bringing Poland into headlong collision with Hitler's powerful war machine, by which it would inevitably have been crushed, I can again quote the same source—Dirksen's diary. Dirksen wrote at the time that Poland would have been left, so to speak, alone face to face with Germany. Here is another source to be noted.

98. All this goes to show that, in the circumstances, it would have been madness for the Soviet Union not

to be concerned with its security. This explains the efforts made by the Soviet Union to create an eastern front by concluding non-aggression and mutual defence pacts with Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. The decision to do so was understood and accepted as a fully justified, important and useful measure by some of the most perspicacious leaders of the western nations.

99. I should in particular like to quote a comment made by Mr. Churchill in this connexion. What he said on 1 October 1939 might well be pondered today by the representatives of the United Kingdom Government present here, more especially as Sir Winston Churchill is again Prime Minister. This, despite a few unfriendly comments on the Soviet Union, is what he said:

"... that the Russian armies should stand on this line is clearly necessary for the safety of Russia against the German menace. At any rate the line is there and an eastern front has been created which Germany does not dare assail. When Herr von Ribbentrop was summoned to Moscow last week, it was to learn the fact and accept the fact that the nazi designs upon the Baltic States and upon the Ukraine must come to a dead stop."

These are the words of the experienced leader of the present British Government, with his expert knowledge of the political affairs of many States. These words are as different as heaven from earth, as day from night, from those we now hear from the United Kingdom representatives and also from the representatives of the United States and of some other countries.

100. The only possible conclusion is that the Soviet Government acted wisely and generously; the consequences of its action were that the Soviet Union succeeded in putting an end to Hitler's invasion and enslavement of Europe, and in destroying his war machine, which had been built up with United States funds from the earliest days of his accession to power. The Soviet Union thus made an immense and decisive contribution to saving the world from the danger of nazi enslavement.

101. I should like, if I may, to take another five minutes to reply briefly to the statement made by the representative of Uruguay, Mr. Domínguez Campora [465th meeting], who raised a whole series of ideological questions. Ideological questions are certainly an interesting subject for discussion, but what bearing do they have on the "atrocities" of which the North Korean heroes and the gallant Chinese People's Volunteers are accused? None whatever. With due respect to Mr. Domínguez Campora, I submit that he was digressing from the point at issue, and embarking on a different subject. He made a few remarks about ideology, revealing the fact that he had read something of Lenin; I trust, however, he will forgive me for pointing out that he is not yet very advanced in this branch of political science. He will have to undertake further studies in order to master that science, a science which has a long history. He referred with surprise to facts which were proclaimed over a hundred years ago in the Communist Manifesto which, as he perhaps knows, was written in 1848 by Marx and Engels, of whom he may have heard. That work dealt with the class struggle and the fundamental law of social development, and with structural changes in societies brought about by revolutions. There have been the English revolution, the great French bour-

geois revolution and the great October revolution. Structural changes, the development of society from feudalism to capitalism and from capitalism to socialism, are brought about by revolution, as is brilliantly expounded in the clear doctrine—the only scientific doctrine—known as Marxism-Leninism. To put on a look of surprise, and attempt to link up the question of “atrocities” with ideology shows, of course, that one’s position is untenable.

102. In questioning the theory of class struggle and of the transformation of *bourgeois* society by means of revolution, Mr. Domínguez Campora was denying facts which are confirmed by the whole course of development of human society, the basic laws of which were, as I have already said, scientifically established long ago. The development of capitalism itself provides an illustration of a class struggle between the feudal lords on the one hand and the manufacturers, industrialists, bankers and capitalists on the other. Ideology is not the cause but the result of this class struggle which leads to the substitution of one pattern of social, economic and political relations for another.

103. Mr. Domínguez Campora spoke of just wars and asserted that we were war-mongers because we admit the possibility of just wars. In other words, we approve of such wars. We do of course approve of just wars in the correct and undistorted sense of the term. It will, for example, be recalled that, as early as 23 February 1942, the then People’s Commissar for Defence of the Soviet Union, Joseph Stalin, issued a decree worded as follows:

“The might of the Red Army resides above all in the fact that it is waging not an expansionist or imperialistic war but a patriotic and righteous war of liberation. What cause could be nobler and loftier than this? No German soldier can say that he is waging a just war, because he cannot fail to realize that he is being forced to fight in order to plunder and oppress other peoples. The German soldier has no lofty and noble war aims which can inspire him and of which he can be proud. Every member of the Red Army, on the other hand, can say with pride that he is waging a just war, a war of liberation for the freedom and independence of his country. The Red Army has noble and lofty war aims which inspire it to heroic deeds. This explains why the patriotic war has produced thousands of heroes prepared to lay down their lives in defence of the freedom of their country.”

104. This is the answer to Mr. Domínguez Campora’s question as to what constitutes a just war. But can there be any doubt on that point? Do we not know with our whole being, mind, heart and senses what constitutes justice and a just war? The term applies to the wars still sometimes called “colonial” wars, in which the peoples rise up in defence of their innate human rights, in defence of their first and most important right, that of national self-determination.

105. All this must be understood and weighed before venturing upon a discourse on the ideology of the Soviet State, the ideology of Lenin, Stalin and Marx.

106. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): In response to the question of the Soviet representative concerning the quotation from the late Premier Stalin, I will say to him that it was quoted in a book entitled

Stalin alla luce della psicologia criminale—“Stalin in the light of criminal psychology”—by Gislerio Flesch, Rome, 1942. What it is, I do not know. I presume that it was based on the following sources.

107. Stalin wrote in 1926:

“There is no dictatorship without force, if dictatorship is to be understood in the strict sense of the term. Lenin defines the dictatorship of the proletariat as ‘State power based directly on force.’”

This comes from Stalin’s *Problems of Leninism*, first published in 1926. The passage can be found on page 139 of the Moscow edition of 1940. Stalin’s quotation from Lenin comes from Lenin’s *Collected Works*, volume XIX (Russian edition), page 315. In another place, Lenin said:

“Dictatorship is power based directly upon force and unrestricted by any laws.”

That quotation is from Lenin, *The proletariat revolution and the renegade Kautsky*, to be found in Lenin’s *Selected Works*, volume VII, page 125. In still another place, Lenin said—and I should like in particular to call this to your attention:

“Courts should not replace terror; to promise this would be deception or self-deception; instead, they should establish and legalize it on principle.”

This statement can be found in Lenin’s *Collected Works*, third edition in Russian, volume XVII, page 296.

108. The PRESIDENT: I recognize the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

109. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I must briefly note the following incontrovertible facts. The quotation given by Mr. Lodge in his speech of 30 November has disappeared. This quotation which, to cite it textually, ran: “Terror is the supreme argument of any power”, no longer exists. Consequently, Mr. Lodge cited an imaginary quotation. It did not exist. Today he resorted to citing *Problems of Leninism* and statements to be found in volume XVII of Lenin’s *Collected Works*. But his quotations were taken out of their context. In their proper context they have an altogether different meaning than the one ascribed to them by Mr. Lodge.

110. Lenin did in fact say that the dictatorship of the proletariat is a power which does not recognize laws. But which laws? The old laws, since after all we have laws now. As you can see for yourselves, the dictatorship of the proletariat—our Soviet State—has a whole body of laws. That is something you cannot deny. Consequently, the passage means something quite different: when the dictatorship of the proletariat is established, in other words, when the working class comes to power, it destroys the old State and the old laws and creates new ones. In other words, it is a power not bound by the old laws. There can be no other interpretation. We are not anarchists, as you very well know. You seem to be able to spell out the words but not to grasp the meaning of what you read.

111. Mr. Lodge said that the courts should not replace terror! But that is obvious nonsense, which his secretaries must also have palmed off on him. Courts are courts, and Soviet courts are courts of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

112. In the book, *The Law of the Soviet State*, which has been published in the United States and which, though ascribed to me, is really the work of several authors produced under my direction, the sentence: "The Soviet court is an organ of the dictatorship of the proletariat" has been translated as: "The Soviet court is an organ under the dictatorship of the proletariat." This is an obvious falsification introduced for a specific purpose. Just as Mr. Lodge might say that in the United States the court is an organ of the State, we say that the Soviet court is an organ of the dictatorship of the proletariat; the translators, however—probably scrupulously edited by one of the gentlemen Mr. Lodge referred to, when quoting Stalin—wrote that the Soviet court was an organ "under" the dictatorship of the proletariat. Distortions such as these can always lead Mr. Lodge astray.

113. Finally, Mr. Lodge found somewhere a remark of Stalin's about terrorism. He was probably quoting

a White Guard, an *émigré*, who wrote a fantastic book called *Stalin alla luce della psicologia criminale*. In other words, he was quoting not Stalin himself, but the author of this book. Will he be kind enough to give us the author's name? Mr. Lodge seems to have realized the impropriety of citing such an author, and so withheld his name.

114. Is there any need for me to say that this is slander from beginning to end, that these are wild ravings? I am surprised that in this gathering, this noble forum, this General Assembly, references should be made to an obscure madman or criminal, an *émigré*, a White Guard, an enemy of the Soviet Union, who does not give the source of the quotation—and Mr. Lodge did not give it either—and who wrote an insane book which it is below human dignity even to touch.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.