

Maureen and Mike

Mansfield Library

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

Archives and Special Collections

Mansfield Library, University of Montana

Missoula MT 59812-9936

Email: library.archives@umontana.edu

Telephone: (406) 243-2053

The following transcript is a scan of the original and has not been edited. For additional assistance, please contact Archives and Special Collections. Please bear in mind that you are reading the spoken word rather than the written word.

TRANSCRIPT OF RADIO TAPE OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD

Speech at United Nations
Paris
1951

The United States denies without reservation or qualification Soviet allegation that we are interfering in the domestic affairs of the Soviet Union or the states responsive to its control. The United States has not committed and will not commit an act of aggression against the Soviet Union or any other country. The entire history of the American people and their system of government underscores the fundamental fact that aggression would be a criminal act. Let there be no doubt on this score whatever. What is the charge against the United States which the Soviet Union has placed before the Assembly? It is based exclusively on the language of an amendment to the United States Mutual Security Act of 1951 enacted by Congress earlier this year. The amendment permits the President to spend up to one-hundred million dollars to organize refugees from Iron Curtain countries into "elements of the military forces supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization." The broad objective of the law is "to maintain the security and promote the foreign policy and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security." In order to achieve that general objective, Congress authorized military, economic, and technical assistance to friendly countries "who strengthen the individual and collective defenses of the free world; to develop their resources in the interest of their security and independence and the national interest of the United States; and to facilitate the effective participation of those countries in the United Nations system for collective security."

Thus, the act was drawn up in the spirit of Article 1 of the Charter. It implements the purposes of the Charter "to take effective, corrective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace." The Mutual Security Act, Mr. Chairman, is only the latest demonstration of our fundamental policy to help in the building of a strong and healthy international community through economic development and collective security. The emergence of this policy and the various measures we have put forward to carry it out constitute the most significant chapter in the history of the United States since the War. When the war ended, many countries lay in ruin. Other less developed countries could not get aid from their more powerful, industrial neighbors who had poured most of their resources into the defeat of the Axis powers. It seemed to us that the solution to the problem lay in the concept of mutual assistance. Out of this concept grew the Economic Recovery Program in which the USSR and other eastern European countries were invited to participate in programs of technical assistance to underdeveloped countries. Within the United Nations there developed other agencies for economic development which the United States firmly supported. All of these efforts were and are designed to help people help themselves. But the concept of mutual assistance also involved a parallel and related effort to achieve collective security against any acts of aggression or a general war. This effort was made necessary by armed Communist coup d'etats in eastern Europe and unmistakable attempts to extend the Iron Curtain into other free countries. It

produced such regional defense associations as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Then, frugally and suddenly, the collective security system of the United Nations itself was called into action to stop the Communist attack on the Republic of Korea. This lead, inevitably, to an intensification and acceleration of our programs of military assistance. This is a free world program. If it is underwritten to a great extent by the United States, it is because Americans identify their own freedom and security with the rights, liberties and national independence of the law-abiding members of the world community. The total appropriation under the Mutual Security Act comes to nearly seven and one-half billion dollars of economic and military assistance to other free countries. Of this total program of aid a large share will go to support the defense effort of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. On August 17 of this year, when the act was being debated on the floor of the House, an amendment was offered to the section of the bill which deals with the defense of the North Atlantic area. The amendment was accepted and incorporated in the law. It became known as the "Escapee Clause" because it authorized the President to provide funds for people who had fled from persecution and tyranny behind the Iron Curtain and who wished to join the North Atlantic Treaty Organization defense forces. It is interesting to observe that neither in its note to the United States nor in the charge it filed almost simultaneously with the United Nations did the Soviet government quote the entire amendment for, in addition to the so-called people's democracies of eastern Europe, the amendment also refers to people who escape from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and, in the

wording of the act, "the Communist dominated or Communist occupied area of Germany and Austria and any other countries absorbed by the Soviet Union." We can only speculate as to why the Soviet Union omitted these references to the amendment to the three Baltic countries which it seized in 1940 in violation of solemn acts of non-aggression and non-intervention. Why did it also leave out the Soviet zone in Austria or eastern Germany, from which people have been escaping at the rate of more than fifteen thousand per month? In point of fact, Soviet allegation places relatively little stress on the real purpose of the amendment---to assist refugees from political persecution take part in the defense of the North Atlantic community if they elect to do so. The Soviet case hangs almost entirely on certain deductions drawn from two words in the amendment. The amendment refers to "elected persons who are residing in or escapees from" the countries and Communist dominated areas listed. Taking off on this point, the Soviet delegation has conjured up a melodramatic picture of a new Fifth Column behind the Iron Curtain which stands poised to strike at the old Fifth Column now in power. In essence, the Soviet argument rests on the assumption that the two words, "residing in," constitute a case of aggression and domestic interference. Perhaps that would be true in a land where wishful thinking about freedom can be a crime against the state. The United States Congress, which passed the Mutual Security Act, is, I think, the best authority as to what the Escapee Clause actually was intended to be. Since this amendment was adopted on the floor of the House, and not in Committee, the House Committee Report did not refer to it.

The intent of Congress is best expressed by the report to the Senate of the Senate Committees on Armed Forces and Foreign Relations on the Mutual Security Act. The comment of the Senate Committee Report on the amendment was as follows, and I quote.

"This paragraph authorizes the sum of not to exceed one-hundred million dollars of the sum authorized to form selected escapees from Iron Curtain countries into elements of military forces supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. In adopting this provision, the Joint Committee desires to make it clear that persons who might be formed into such units would do so openly of their own free will."

This was the only formal comment on the amendment by a Congressional committee. This amendment applies only to those people who have managed to flee to this side of the Iron Curtain. The President can use the authority and the funds Congress gave him under the amendment, but it is not mandatory upon him to do so. In any case, the ultimate determinate as to whether these people will form part of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization defense forces will depend upon the decision of the NATO partners themselves. If, in the judgment of members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, men who escape from behind the Curtain should be allowed to participate in the defense of Europe, the President has Congressional authority to use funds for this purpose. Up to the present time, no tangible step of any kind has been taken beyond the passage of a piece of permissive legislation. Neither the President nor the administrative authority established by the Mutual Security Act has taken any action. If, as the Soviet delegate claims, all of this constitutes an act of aggression

and domestic interference, then we are indeed living in a world where words have lost their meaning. But, assuming, Mr. Chairman, that words still mean the same to the vast majority of mankind, we can only ask why the Soviet government has made this baseless charge against the United States. How could the Soviet regime twist and distort this amendment to an American domestic law into an act of aggression and interference in the affairs of the Soviet Union and the other Iron Curtain states? One explanation for the Soviet attack on the Mutual Security Act is that the Soviet Union has been casting about for something new to say against the defense effort of the North Atlantic community and the wider effort to achieve collective security throughout the free world. I do not believe it is necessary here to dwell at length on the origin, purpose and defensive nature of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization except to say this: NATO, or something like it, was the inevitable response of the countries of the North Atlantic area to the extension of Soviet power by force and subversion in eastern Europe and the clear threat to extend that power further. NATO is an attempt to pool resources in a given geographical region to achieve a measure of collective security against this aggressive strength. It derives its purposes from those of the United Nations Charter, which it serves both in letter and in spirit. The NATO military forces, still modest compared to the armies on the other side of the Iron Curtain, are, nevertheless, growing. We have high hopes that, pending Soviet agreement to join in a United Nations program of effective world disarmament, they will have the effect of discouraging any further efforts to extend the Iron Curtain westward. It is only a regime which projects its own image on the world outside that would see

the North Atlantic Treaty Pact as an aggressive threat. I think we must remember that no Communist government has ever come to power with majority support in a free and an honest election. Regimes of the totalitarian type are not fooled by their ninety-eight and ninety-nine per cent votes in favor of the Communist candidates. They know that these are mechanical demonstrations, not votes of confidence. They, therefore, have no feeling of confidence in the people they dominate. This lack of confidence leads the regime to an obsession with its physical safety that is unknown in the free world. The regime beings to lash out at shadows and difficult enemies. There is soon a vicious circle of mistrust and suspicion until fear permeates the entire state's structure. No one is safe, not even the highest and most respected members of the party, as all of us around this table know only too well. High government and party officials sometimes disappear without a trace. Others are shot or imprisoned after highly publicized, but transparently fake, treason trials where the accused is declared guilty before he is tried. The names of these Communist leaders are matters of public record and could easily be cited. When you have a political organization which devours its own members, is it any wonder that its leaders attribute all matters of sinister motives to the governments of foreign countries. When aviators from my country wander off their course into Hungarian territory, they are forced down by Soviet fighters and alledged to be on an "espionage" mission. Newspaper correspondents from foreign countries have been tried on espionage and thrown into prison. Iron Curtain regimes regard our diplomats as spies. It would appear as

though anyone who went into these foreign countries and who has breathed the air of freedom is looked upon as a secret agent. When the men who control these governments search among the masses of their own population for scapegoats and conduct mass arrests, is it any wonder that thousands upon thousands of people yearn for escape. Finally, is it any wonder that many of these people insist that they be allowed to join any defensive effort to prevent an extension of the system they have escaped. It is these people, Mr. Chairman, who are the escapees referred to in the amendment to the Mutual Security Act. There is no safety valve for legitimate political actions of opposition behind the Iron Curtain. Average citizens who disapprove of the regime have few alternatives. He can stay and take it, hoping for better days. He can go into underground opposition and risk imprisonment and execution, or he can try to escape. It may be that the population of eastern Europe is a Fifth Column against the regimes in power. If there is such a Fifth Column, it has nothing to do with the phrase in the United States Mutual Security Act of 1951 or with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Such a Fifth Column would be the product of the brutal liquidation of independent political parties; of forced labor without trial for political dissidence; of the denial of all civil rights. It would reflect the denial of all normal relations with foreigners or the world outside. The rigidly enforced state's secret acts by which casual conversation can be legally changed into espionage or treason. It would stem from the uprooting of thousands of families from their homes by forced deportation in all of the Iron Curtain countries. We know that within the Soviet Union. For example, several so-called autonomous republics were simply extinguished, both

during and after the War, and their inhabitants, a million or more people, were sent in cattle cars to central Asia. Hundreds of thousands of Soviet citizens, left stranded in Germany at the end of the War, refused to return home and sought, instead, to seek a new life abroad. Many of them are now rebuilding their homes and their families in the New World but, by Soviet law, these ordinary people, farmers and workers, are traitors and would be shot if they returned to the Soviet Union. Since the seizure of power by Communist minorities in eastern Europe since the War, under the protection of the Soviet army, there has been a tragic new wave of political refugees from eastern Germany into western Berlin and the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany. There has been nothing less than a mass movement involving hundreds of thousands of people. But then, it is relatively easier to cross the line in Germany than to cross it on the Czechoslovak or Hungarian frontiers, where the heavily reinforced border guards are on patrol day and night. Human ingenuity is such, however, that men, women, and children continue to get through. Some thirteen-hundred to fifteen-hundred people manage to break through the Iron Curtain every month and tens of thousands have come out since 1949. Can these people be described as traitors? Is the Ukrainian peasant or the engineer of a Czech locomotive or the Polish miner who makes his way westward a war criminal? This is what the Soviet delegation calls these refugees. How are we to react when these people ask us whether there is something they can do to prevent the extension of the system they have risked their lives to escape. Our answer is that they should have the right to join in the defense

of free Europe. If these unfortunate people are granted asylum; if they are permitted to join the NATO defense forces at their own request, does it follow that the United States or the NATO powers, collectively, are interfering in the domestic affairs of the Soviet Union and the other Communist states? It most assuredly does not, Mr. Chairman. Yet, in effect, this is the Soviet's contention. Moreover, the Soviet government charges that the United States has, thereby, violated the Roosevelt-Litvinov Agreement of 1933. The Roosevelt-Litvinov Agreement precedes the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. In the light of the activities and professed goals of the Communist International, President Roosevelt took the initiative for a clear statement on the principle of non-interference. The Agreement included a pledge by the Soviet government not to permit the formation on Soviet territory of any group whose aim was the overthrow of the government of the United States. When President Roosevelt had received the necessary assurances from Mr. Litvinov, he stated that the United States would adhere reciprocally to the pledge given by the Soviet government. For all practical purposes the Soviet government made a dead letter of the Roosevelt-Litvinov Agreement shortly after it was signed. On its part, however, the United States has adhered to this reciprocal pledge from that day to this. Shortly after the establishment of diplomatic relations, the President instructed our ambassador to Moscow to make all protest against the violation of the Roosevelt-Litvinov Agreement by the Soviet Union. When, in 1935, the Comintern met in Moscow and instructed the American

Communist Party to use "Trojan horse" tactics against the American government, the President sent a strong note of protest to the Soviet government. He said the United States anticipated the most serious consequences if the Soviet government refused to prevent further acts of disregard of the solemn pledge given by him to the United States. The Soviet government replied that it was in no way responsible for the activities of the Comintern but, oddly enough, after the Soviet regime seized power in 1917, all allies and neutral missions in Petrograd received this circular from the Soviet leader:

"The Soviet power considers diplomatic relations necessary, not only with government, but also with revolutionary Socialist parties seeking the overthrow of existing government."

In the light of the use of the Comintern, and now the Cominform, by Soviet leaders, we ask the Soviet delegation whether this does not continue to be the policy of the Soviet government. The outline of History of the Communist International, published in Moscow in 1934, states:

"Comrade Stalin took a leading part in the working out of the program of the Communist International. There is not a single important decision of the Communist International, not a forecast which is not permeated with Stalin's foresightedness, his ability to map out a line of attack and strike a crushing blow at the enemy."

It is not surprising that Secretary of State Hull described the Soviet reply to our note of protest as a repudiation of the Soviet pledge "almost in so many words." Soviet interference in the domestic

affairs of foreign countries continues to be one of the chief causes of tension in the world today. It is, indeed, one of the supreme ironies' of all time that the Soviet regime should be pressing the charge of domestic interference against any foreign government, let alone the United States. The Soviet Union continued to use the Comintern for an instrument of direct action against all governments until its formal dissolution in 1943. Who can forget the painful period between 1939 and 1941 when every Communist party throughout the world, on orders from Moscow, tried to sabotage the efforts of the democracies to defend themselves against Nazi aggression. At the end of the War, the Soviet government persistently followed a policy of aggressive intervention in the domestic affairs of other nations and people. Upon the very countries listed in the complaint before this very committee, the Soviet Union has imposed dictatorial, Communist regimes responsible not to their own people, but to the Soviet government itself. The fondest feelings for family and country of Poles, Czechoslovaks and Hungarians and others have been deliberately trampled upon. Only a short time ago, the Yugoslav delegation presented to the Assembly a case history of Soviet intervention in the domestic affairs of a foreign nation, in this instance, Yugoslavia. When the Yugoslav Communist party was expelled from the Cominform, the highest leaders of the Soviet state then demanded that the Yugoslav people overthrow the Yugoslav government. Nor will the world ever forget the most outstanding case of intervention of all---the Communist attack on the Republic of Korea, supported by Soviet-equipped training and propaganda. Here was a brutal attempt by

a Communist minority to conquer by armed force a small nation, a state established under United Nations auspices and now defended by the United Nations. These are only the most spectacular cases. The Soviet government also used the International Communist apparatus to undermine the policies of other governments beyond its immediate grasp. The signal for this campaign was given in 1947 with the recreation of a new model of the Comintern in the shape of the Cominform. The activities of the Communist apparatus abroad, centrally directed by the Soviet government, have made it almost impossible for us to have normal disagreements with the Soviet Union. For when the Soviet government disagrees with you on an important matter of policy, it uses the particular Communist instrument in your country to wreck that policy by every means possible. I am not talking about secret directives or underground channels or mysterious subsidies for the Communist threat or anything that is not in the public domain. I am speaking only of direct instructions sent openly by leaders of the Soviet state to Communist outlets abroad. I am speaking of the actions of the Soviet government. In 1947, when it was invited to participate in the program for European recovery, the so-called Marshall Plan, not only did the Soviet government refuse that invitation, it also ordered the governments in eastern Europe to do likewise, an open case of domestic interference in their internal affairs. This could have been a simple disagreement on a matter of policy but in September, 1947, the Soviet regime organized the Cominform and called on all its Communists to smash the Marshall Plan. The late Andre Stanov, then a member of the Soviet Politburo told the first meeting of the Cominform in December, 1947, "as far as the USSR

is concerned, the USSR will make every effort to prevent this plan from being realized. The Communists must be the leading force in the struggle against a new United States expansionist plan." The highly unsuccessful effort of the Cominform sabotaged the recovery of Europe immediately following. Two years later the North Atlantic community made its first step toward rearmament in the face of the aggressive policies of the Soviet government. At a meeting in Bucharest a more urgent directive for action within the North Atlantic community was given to the members of the Cominform by M. A. Sukloff, editor of Pravda, chief organ of the Soviet Communist Party. He called indeed for "energetic, concrete action" in order to frustrate the North Atlantic defense effort. He praised the use of "fright and demonstration" and other "forces" for the smashing of the policy opposed by the Soviet Union. Mr. Sukloff declared, and I quote again, "It is necessary to use varied forms and methods, mass demonstrations, meetings, gatherings, petitions and protest, public opinion polls, the formation of peace committees in town and countryside. One should not act in a stereotyped fashion. The concrete conditions of these countries should be considered." His instructions, openly delivered to members of other Communist parties by an important Soviet representative, indicate a total disregard for the whole principle of non-interference. Finally, Mr. Chairman, there is a whole network of so-called "peace" committees, organized by the Cominform under Soviet direction. These so-called peace organizations have duped many innocent people. They are, in fact, instruments of Soviet foreign policy in foreign countries.

Their prime purpose is not to promote peace, or even to carry on peaceful propaganda. They are part of a general apparatus designed for direct action. We find that special attention is given to the establishment of the so-called peace committees in plants and factories so as to encourage the workers to sabotage the defense efforts of their country. The World Federation of Trade Unions, an international Communist agency, sent out the following instructions to its members on December 9, 1950. I am quoting again: "Organize even more resolute action against the transportation and production of arms. Draw up and put into effect a plan for a powerful unity movement to hinder the rearmament program. Link closely the struggle for peace with the struggle to satisfy the urges and vital demands of the working people." I think, Mr. Chairman, that the vast majority of the people represented here know that their interests lie in the defense of their own country and not in promoting the aggressive policies of the Soviet Union. I cite these examples as appeals for direct action, only as indications of what actually takes place when the Soviet government is against you on any important matter of policy. You are immediately confronted with an organized attempt by the Soviet government to interfere with the policy on your own soil. Nor is there any secret about it as the public statement I have quoted has demonstrated. Here is another reason why the American people, and I am sure the people of many other countries have found it supremely ironic that a charge of domestic interference against the United States has come from the self-appointed center of the international Communist movement. Through the Comintern, then the Cominform and through local Communist parties the Soviet Union has raised domestic interference

to the status of an international profession of providing employment to many thousands of people. The American people and many other people have spoken out against this interference and have spoken out against the domination by the Soviet Union of the states of eastern Europe, the states listed in the complaint against us. Until these eastern European countries are once again independent and in control of their own interests and destinies, Americans will continue to speak out against the tyranny imposed upon them. It is not an act of aggression, Mr. Chairman, to hope that a people in chains will one day be free. It is not an act of domestic interference to express that hope in public. This hope of ours that freedom and independence will be worldwide is shared with many millions of people. For America, this hope is anchored deep in our own National philosophy. We abide by the self-evident truths stated in our own Declaration of Independence that government exists to secure for all men certain inalienable rights; that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed; that, when government becomes destructive to these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it and to institute new government. The American people have no intention of repealing the Declaration of Independence. We wish, instead, to see the day when all people who have sought asylum with the free nations will have the chance to return peacefully to their homes and start their lives again in the country of their birth. It lies within the power of the Soviet government to bring this peaceful and happy change about. Real security for the Soviet state does not and cannot rest on the domination of other people. Real security for any state does not depend

upon domination by any means, but upon the consent of the governed. In that sense, the interests of the Soviet Union and the people of eastern Europe will best be served if the Iron Curtain refugees of today can become the tourists of tomorrow. Mr. Chairman, the intentions of the United States down through its entire history have been to live and to let live. We have desired no territory, and we have emerged from two world wars with no conquest of territory. We have sent our men abroad to fight in foreign countries at the side of other nations struggling to save their freedom. We have done so for ideals we thought worth fighting for. We have laid great trust in the written and spoken words of other governments because we do not care to see a world in which no trust exists. As an expression of that trust, we demobilized our armies after World War II. We scrapped our air fleets and we put our navy in mothballs. We had thought it worthwhile to offer help to other countries including the Soviet Union because the help was needed. Moreover, our ties with foreign countries are close. We are a nation in which Frenchmen, Englishmen, Czechs, Poles, Hungarians, Italians, Russians, Chinese, Japanese, Africans, Scandinavians and many other national groups have somehow found a common denominator in the concept of freedom. Where there is imperfect freedom in the United States, you will inevitably hear many voices of protest shouting from the housetops. We Americans, we immigrants and sons of immigrants from every corner of the world, have no aggressive ambitions. Everything we do we discuss in the open for all of the world to hear it. We have no hidden motives nor designs against any people anywhere, nor would this be possible in a nation where

all public life goes on in the greatest goldfish bowl in the world. We have, it is true, come by great international responsibilities in the very recent past, but we do not feel that a position of leadership suddenly arrogates to the leader all of the wisdom in the world, or, what is worse, the self delusion of knowing all of the answers. So far as the defense effort of the free world is concerned, we regard it as a product of the collective wisdom of free men, but it is instinctive with people who have the power to make up their own minds to speak the way of common sense. That is why we have joined France and the United Kingdom on disarmament proposals designed to lessen international tension and make the world a more peaceable place to live. All of us in the United Nations have a responsibility which is not served by making baseless charges against one another. We are now approaching a great religious anniversary that will be observed in many lands, but the spirit of which this occasion is a symbol is common to all of the great religions of the world. In that spirit, Mr. Chairman, which all people share in common, let us express the hope that we can shortly return to the great constructive paths that lay before us---the reduction of tensions to effective disarmament; the raising of living standards of the world; the extension of human rights to all people and the establishment of a world peace based on justice, tolerance and mutual understanding for all men everywhere.

Thank you.