



**V. M. MOLOTOV**

**on Armed Forces of the United  
Nations on Foreign Territory**

**Speeches in Committee I of the General  
Assembly of the United Nations**

**November, 1946**

*Texts of Speeches by*

## **V. M. MOLOTOV**

*Minister for Foreign Affairs of the  
USSR, Head of the Soviet Delegation  
to the General Assembly of  
the United Nations Organization*

*on*

### **ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED NATIONS ON FOREIGN TERRITORY**

*in*

**Committee I**

*of the*

**UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**November, 1946, New York City**

# Contents

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| On the Presence of the Armed Forces of Members of the<br>United Nations on the Territory of Non-Enemy States—<br>Speech of November 20..... | 3    |
| Speech of November 21.....  | 10   |
| The Question of Allied Troops Abroad—<br>Speech of November 22.....   | 13   |
| Speech of November 26.....  | 27   |

Published by  
The Embassy of the Union of Soviet  
Socialist Republics  
at 3031 Gates Road, N. W., Washington 8, D. C.  
November, 1946

# On the Presence of the Armed Forces of Members of the United Nations on the Territory of Non-Enemy States —Speech of November 20

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen:

**T**HE question of the presence of United Nations forces in the territories of non-enemy states has great political importance. It has been widely commented upon in the United Nations Organization. There has been even more comment on this subject in the press.

During the war, it was inevitable that Allied troops should enter the territories of other friendly states. This is particularly true of the troops of such countries as the United States of America, Great Britain and the Soviet Union. As we now know the Allied troops accomplished a great mission in liberating those nations which in the course of the war had fallen under the heel of Hitlerism and its allies. Who can forget the enthusiasm with which American and British troops were welcomed at that time in France and Belgium, or Soviet troops in Poland, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia? In certain cases Allied troops had to enter the territories of members of the United Nations even prior to enemy invasion as a preventive measure. The services of the great democratic powers and of other Allied countries in this struggle are indisputable and, in particular, their services in the restoration of liberty and independence to those friendly countries whose own forces were insufficient to defeat the invading fascist troops.

However, the war has been over for a long time. The tasks facing the armed forces of the United Nations have been completely fulfilled. One might have thought that because of this, Allied troops would have been called home. In any case the reasons for which they had entered the territories of other states have disappeared. Nevertheless, in some cases the troops of Allied states still remain in foreign countries, and serve as an instrument

for foreign interference in the internal affairs of these countries, and bring pressure to bear on relations among states.

Furthermore, certain powers have set up a widespread network of air and naval bases far beyond their frontiers.

There is no need for me to say that the presence of Allied troops in foreign territories many months after the end of the war cannot fail to arouse the natural uneasiness of the friendly peoples of these countries where foreign troops still remain. One cannot fail to take into account the fact that world public opinion, interested in the establishment of a stable peace and universal security, is displaying marked concern for the situation that has arisen. This naturally is not applicable to the territories of former enemy states inasmuch as there are serious grounds for the presence of Allied troops in such territories.

It is generally known that in certain cases considerable Allied armed forces are to be found in the territories of former enemy states. And, nevertheless, the presence of armed forces of the Allied powers in Germany and Japan, for instance, arouses no misgivings in anyone's mind. The presence of Allied troops in these territories which were greatly contaminated with fascism and militarism is essential for the purpose of accomplishing the important tasks of demilitarization and democratization placed on the Allies, which tasks correspond to the interests of universal peace and security. It is equally clear that Allied troops remain on territories of other former enemy states inasmuch as the armistice terms are still in force, but only until the conclusion of peace treaties.

All this is not applicable to those states which belonged to the Allied camp. In regard to these states, the presence of foreign troops can no longer be justified, except in such special cases as the maintenance of communications with former enemy states and even so only for the period of occupation of these former enemy countries.

Such are the views of the Soviet Government. And in accordance with this the Soviet Government has already drawn practical conclusions.

In the course of the war Soviet troops entered the territories of Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Norway, for instance. However, immediately after the end of the war measures were

taken for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from these territories. As early as last autumn the troops were withdrawn from these countries and announcements to this effect were published.

Toward the end of the war against Germany, Soviet troops had also been obliged to land on the Island of Bornholm, belonging to Denmark. In April last the evacuation of Soviet troops from this island, too, was completed.

We all remember that last autumn Soviet troops began operations against Japan and routed the Japanese forces in Manchuria. As you know from published official reports, the withdrawal of Soviet troops from China began as early as the end of last year and was completed by May 3.

Following Germany's attack on the USSR, Soviet troops on the one hand and British troops on the other had to enter the territory of Iran in order to safeguard Allied communications, which were important in time of war. At the beginning of the year a great deal of commotion was raised about the question of the presence in Iranian territory of the Soviet troops that still remained there. But as we know, the evacuation of Soviet troops from Iran was also fully completed by the beginning of last May.

Some Soviet military units are stationed at present in the territory of Poland for the protection of lines of communication to Germany. This situation has not given rise to any misunderstanding in the relations of the Soviet Union with Poland and has, of course, been fully understood by our other Allies.

Lastly, there are Soviet military contingents in North Korea. Their presence there is provided for by a definite agreement between the USSR and the Allied powers. Accordingly, this case cannot be a basis for misunderstandings.

The situation that has arisen with regard to American and British troops in the territory of certain members of the United Nations is different. As we know, there are armed forces of the United States of America and Great Britain in the territory of a number of member states of the United Nations, where they appeared during the war, but where they still remain now, after a long time has passed since the end of the war. Among these states are both countries of Europe and states of South America, both countries in Africa and states in Asia. It is enough to say that armed forces of the United States of America and Great

Britain, including air and naval bases, are still to be found in all parts of the globe, including various territories of the Pacific, Atlantic and Indian Oceans. Moreover, there has recently been much talk about the interest displayed by the leaders of the armed forces of certain countries in such remote areas as the Arctic. It is obvious that the whole picture—which can convey a comprehensive idea of the whole problem—can only be presented to us by the representatives of the United States of America and Great Britain themselves.

There is no need for me at present to dwell at length on the political aspect of the whole problem under discussion. I hope that this question is, in the main, sufficiently clear to the representatives of the states present here.

After the above-said, I should like to remind you that as long ago as August the Soviet Government proposed that the member states of the United Nations submit to the Security Council definite information regarding their armed forces located in other territories of the United Nations. It was proposed that the governments submit the following information:

First, information indicating at what points of the territory of members of the United Nations and other friendly states and in what number are armed forces of other members of the United Nations.

Second, information indicating at what points in the above-mentioned territories are air and naval bases and what is the size of their garrisons belonging to the armed forces of other member states of the United Nations Organization.

Aside from political considerations, this information is necessary to the Security Council and Military Staff Committee, who are now studying the problem of armed forces to be placed by the United Nations at the disposal of the Security Council in the interests of safeguarding universal peace under Article 43 of the Charter. And the Soviet Government has, for its part, expressed its readiness to submit this information to the Security Council.

You also know that in the General Assembly Mr. Austin has stated the views of the United States of America on this subject. Mr. Austin did not object to the proposal of the Soviet Union, but he widened the question by suggesting that information be

submitted regarding all mobilized armed forces both abroad and at home. Thus he indicated the necessity of submitting information with regard to Allied troops in the territories of the former enemy states as well.

The Soviet Government is willing to meet these proposals. It hopes to reach agreement on this question both with the Government of the United States and other Governments.

Above all, the Soviet Government expresses its agreement that all states should submit full information with regard to their armed forces stationed abroad, as suggested by the United States Government. Thus both the Soviet and United States Governments agree to submit information regarding the armed forces stationed in the territories of friendly states, as well as regarding the armed forces present in the territories of former enemy states. By including this latter addition we could get a combined Soviet-American proposal which would cover the whole problem of armed forces abroad.

When it receives this information, the Security Council will be able to have a complete picture of the armed forces which individual states have stationed beyond their confines. This information will be of great value to the Security Council and the Military Staff Committee, which is now studying the problem of armed forces required by the United Nations Organization for the maintenance of international peace and security.

As for the armed forces of the United Nations stationed within each country, this question, too, must receive its solution. It is true that this question has no direct relevance to the proposal under discussion now. However, we all have deemed it essential to discuss also the problem of general reduction of armaments. This means that, once we have adopted such a decision, we shall have to deal with the question of armed forces as a whole.

Naturally, the examination of the problem of general reduction of armaments is bound up with the necessity of having a complete idea both of the armed forces stationed abroad and of the armed forces at home. General disarmament should extend to all countries and should include all armed services, wherever they may be. Accordingly, as regards this question too—namely the troops at home—we shall be able to reach an agreed decision



when we get down to the examination of the problem of general reduction of armaments.

We must not minimize, however, the importance of the question which has been brought up today for our consideration. The question of the armed forces of members of the United Nations that have been stationed abroad for many months since the end of the war should not be drowned in more general problems that are to be subjected to special consideration.

In conformity with the remarks made by me, the Soviet draft was modified to include the addition mentioned by me and taken from the proposal of Mr. Austin. I submit this revised draft for your consideration and for subsequent submission to the General Assembly. Its text is as follows:

"The General Assembly recommends to the Security Council that it take a decision to the effect that member states of the United Nations Organization should submit the following information to the Secretary General and to the Security Council within a month:

"1. At what points in the territory of members of the United Nations or other states, with the exception of former enemy territories, and in what number, are armed forces of other members of the United Nations.

"2. At what points in the former enemy states and in what number are armed forces of the Allied powers and other members of the United Nations.

"3. At what points in the above-mentioned territories are air and naval bases and what is the size of their garrisons belonging to the armed forces of member states of the United Nations.

"4. The information to be provided under paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 should refer to the situation as it existed on November 1, 1946."

We all should submit this information to the Security Council. We have no justification to refuse to do this or to hide from the United Nations Organization the actual situation with respect to our armed forces abroad. Not a single country should shirk this obligation, as this is necessary to enable the Security Council to accomplish the tasks assigned to it by the Charter.

The Soviet Union is willing to do what is required by the

present draft. We hope that the other governments, too, will agree to do this.

There can be no doubt that the positive solution of this question will serve the interests of peace and international security.

## Speech of November 21

Mr. Chairman:

I HAVE no need to speak now on the substance of the question, since most of the delegates who have spoken here have raised no objections in principle to the Soviet Delegation's proposal. Should objections be voiced against this proposal I would like in that case, of course, to retain the right to express my opinion on the substance of the question also.

A question was asked here by Sir Alexander Cadogan, the United Kingdom representative. He asked an explanation of the purpose of raising this question in the General Assembly. I am ready to do this again, but I would like to draw your attention to the fact that I have twice already explained the purposes of the Soviet proposal. I spoke in the General Assembly on this question, and yesterday I made a statement in this Committee. In both cases I tried to explain the reasons which led the Soviet Delegation to raise this question.

Possibly Sir Alexander Cadogan's question yesterday is to be explained by the fact that I spoke in Russian. Obviously the translation made the matter more difficult. But yesterday English and French texts of my speech were circulated to the delegates. Accordingly, I don't think that I need dwell in detail on what was said in my speech yesterday.

Briefly, the purpose of the Soviet proposal is as follows. I am repeating it in order to eliminate any misunderstanding as to there being something that is not clear in this question. We are all well aware that there is a Chapter VII of the Charter entitled: "Action with Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace and Acts of Aggression." In this Chapter there is an Article 43 which reads as follows:

"1. All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary

for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

"2. Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.

"3. The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and members or between the Security Council and groups of members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes."

At the present moment the Military Staff Committee of the Security Council is, as it happens, studying the problem of how to ensure the execution of Article 43 of the Charter. It seems to me that, if information were received from all states regarding the presence of their armed forces outside their own countries, it would facilitate the preparation of the agreements referred to in Article 43. Without this data it would be difficult for the Military Staff Committee to cope with its task and, perhaps, it would be quite impossible to work out such a scheme for the organization of the armed forces which are to be at the disposal of the United Nations as would be appropriate to the actual state of affairs and would be a real guarantee of the accomplishment of such tasks as are implicit in the Charter of the Organization.

Naturally, it is not merely a matter of submitting this or that information, nor even of the work which is to be done by the Military Staff Committee.

It seems to me absolutely obvious that the submission of such information to the Security Council for its disposal will also have major political significance. In any case we will then have a complete picture of the countries which have armed forces beyond their own borders, their location and their numbers. And when all of us without exception place such information at the disposal of the Security Council and the Secretary General of the United Nations, when this picture is absolutely clear for us all, much will be a good deal clearer to us. In any case the receipt of such information will enable us to judge whether this question—the question of the presence of the armed forces of members

of the United Nations in foreign territories—is of serious political significance. It is very important for all of us to have an exact idea of the actual situation in this matter, and I think it is in the interest of universal peace and of ensuring the freedom and independence of all countries, and in particular of the small nations, and it will also help in achieving the peaceful purposes which are the main task of the United Nations.

That is what I wanted to say in addition to my previous statements on this question.

# The Question of Allied Troops Abroad

## —Speech of November 22

Mr. Chairman, Delegates:

**W**E are discussing an important question. Most of the representatives speaking here have recognized this.

Certainly we should discuss questions which concern every country, insofar as they affect certain vital interests of security or of national independence. This being so, there is all the more reason for us to discuss questions, such as the present one, which affect the problem of universal peace and the development of friendly relations among all states. In the present case both the interests of the Great Powers and of the small countries are concerned.

The proposal of the Soviet Government that the members of the United Nations should submit information regarding their troops, insofar as they are stationed outside the confines of their own countries and, in particular, on the territory of one or another of the United Nations, concerns, above all, the Great Powers. The submission of this information should be regarded by the Great Powers as the fulfillment of their duty toward other states, the small countries in particular. Small countries cannot stand aside from this question either. They will also have to submit their information on this subject, if we accept the proposal of the Soviet Government.

The submission of this information by the great and small countries will provide us with a complete picture of the situation regarding troops of members of the United Nations stationed on the territories of other countries, and at the same time will ensure the accuracy of the information and its reciprocal verification. This information would have to be submitted to the Secretary General of the United Nations and to the Security Council.

I have already spoken of the tremendous services and sacrifices of the Great Powers in liberating the territory of certain friendly states which were invaded by the fascist aggressors. These services

are very great and beyond dispute. They will redound to the glory of the liberators throughout the ages.

During the war, when the enemy threatened the very existence of some states, the troops of the Allies exerted their efforts to put an end to enemy invasion and to restore to the peoples their freedom and democratic rights. But other times have come. The war is over, but Allied troops still remain in some cases on the territories of other members of the United Nations. It is quite obvious that in view of the change-over from war to peace, the previous reasons and occasions for this have disappeared. If since the end of the war, more than a year after the defeat of the enemy, troops of other members of the United Nations still remain on the territories of friendly states, the previous explanation cannot be put forward in justification. Obviously there are other reasons. However, we have no precise knowledge on this score. But why should we not have this knowledge? Why should not the United Nations Organization be informed on a question of this kind, which affects very important aspects of the mutual relations among states?

## I

### Principles and Practice

**I**N Chapter I of the Charter, dealing with the purposes and principles of the United Nations, it is stated that:

"All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

We all adhere to these principles and must take care that they do not merely remain on paper, but are put into practice. In pursuance of these principles we must not permit any actions in relations with other countries such as affect "the political independence of any state." Only in that case shall we be fulfilling the obligations which we assumed when we joined the United Nations Organization.

It is natural that such a matter as the presence of the forces of one country on the territory of another country at the present time, when the war is over, and it is not a military necessity, gives rise to various interpretations. Such a situation cannot but

provoke dissatisfaction among the nations. World public opinion is watching it with anxiety. It cannot be denied also that the authority of the international organization to which we belong is being affected thereby.

In some cases, an even unwarranted significance has been ascribed to the presence of Allied forces on the territory of other members of the United Nations. For example, when Soviet army units were delayed for some weeks on the territory of Iran, that became the subject of discussion at many meetings of the Security Council. A great hubbub was raised about it. There were many speeches than about the undesirable and inadmissible retention of the forces of one of the United Nations on the territory of another member of the United Nations.

The Soviet Union did not permit itself to wait very long before acting in that case. The evacuation of Soviet military units from Iranian territory was promptly concluded within the term stated by the Soviet Government. Six months have already passed since then, but the Security Council has not yet even found it opportune to withdraw the question of the retention of Soviet forces on the territory of Iran from its agenda. Meanwhile, is it possible to be entirely certain of the fact that other states have also entirely withdrawn their soldiers from the territory of Iran? At all events, we have not yet sufficiently definite information on that score. It only remains to add that one standard should not be applied in some cases, and another standard in other cases. It should be necessary in all cases, and in relations among all states, to adhere to a single standard. Only such a system as that, in the work of an international organization, will really serve to fortify its authority.

It is necessary to acknowledge that when we speak of the presence of the forces of one of the United Nations on the territory of another member of the United Nations, we are touching on a serious question. There can be no getting away from it. There should be complete clarity among the United Nations in such questions.

We all know about the presence of British troops on the territory of Greece. The British forces came to Greece when that was necessary in the struggle against fascist Germany. But that struggle has long been at an end. Nevertheless, British forces have not



left Greece. This is now exciting general attention. Why is it necessary for the forces of the powerful British Empire to remain on the territory of little Greece, many months after the end of the war? Nobody can deny that the presence of these foreign troops is exercising a strong pressure on the entire internal situation in Greece. As a result of this, Greece has been transformed into perhaps the most restless country in Europe. Have we really the right to overlook this fact?

Take another example. The troops of the United States continue to remain on the territory of China. We are told that they are stationed on that territory by agreement between the United States and the Chinese governments "for cooperation in the fulfillment of certain definite obligations in connection with the disarmament and evacuation of Japanese soldiers and civilians." But such reasons are scarcely convincing. The question arises as to whether the Chinese Government cannot dispense with foreign troops now that the enemy has been defeated and the war has long since been finished. We are told that the number of United States troops in China is small. But this merely confirms the view that there is no need for United States troops there. Meanwhile the retention of United States troops obviously complicates the internal development of China, increasing the dissension within the country and creating a peculiar situation for the Chinese Republic in its relations with the outside world. So long as United States troops remain in China, this question cannot be removed from the agenda and will acquire ever increasing international significance.

The fact is also of importance that certain powers have their military, air and naval bases in almost all parts of the globe. The creation of these bases had its meaning in wartime. But how can the United Nations ignore a situation where, even after the end of the war, the number of air and naval bases of certain states continues to remain very large, and the network of these bases belonging to the United States of America and the United Kingdom covers all continents and oceans? And this despite the fact that the war is long since ended!

The representative of Panama made some remarks here. He spoke about the military bases of the United States of America in Panama. He said that part of the United States bases had

been returned to Panama and that, with regard to other bases, his Government hoped to come to an agreement with the United States Government. It is clear from his remarks that up to the present there are still United States bases remaining in Panama.

The representative of Brazil also spoke here. He reminded us of the existence of military bases on Brazilian territory. We learned from his remarks that at the present time those specialists remain in Brazil who serviced these bases. Obviously the need for American specialists at bases in Brazil still continues. This fact attracts attention since we are living in peacetime conditions.

We all read in the newspapers quite recently of the dispute between the United States of America and Iceland over the same question of military bases. The United States has a population of about 140 million, whereas Iceland has about 130 thousand; that is to say, about one thousand times less. For a few months we read in the newspapers of the dispute between the United States of America and Iceland over the fact that United States bases remained on the territory of Iceland. The mighty United States was disputing with Iceland—the smallest state to join the United Nations—in order to try to retain the American bases on Icelandic territory, although general peace has now been restored. And this dispute, as you know, assumed international significance.

I have given you but a few examples to illustrate the meaning of the question raised by the Soviet Government. The number of such examples could have been multiplied many times.

The presence of troops belonging to one of the United Nations on the territory of another of the United Nations, when the war is over and peace re-established, merits general notice. Exaggerated rumors are spread; doubt and dissatisfaction among nations are caused. Nor can it be denied that the presence of foreign troops on a state's territory is an unwarranted means of exercising pressure in the domestic affairs of that state. In certain cases the presence of foreign troops pursues not only the aim of bringing foreign pressure to bear in the domestic affairs of the country, but is also used to create an external threat to neighboring countries. An end must be put to this situation.

### The Soviet Proposal and American Additions

**I**N order to remove the causes for any discussion in connection with this, it is necessary that all members of the United Nations should give full information about what troops they have on the territory of other members of the United Nations. This will clear the air. That clarity which is necessary to the establishment of mutual trust will be brought into the relations between large and small states. There are no grounds for refusing to give the United Nations Organization information on all these facts. On the contrary, if the United Nations received this information, it would facilitate healthier international relations and strengthen the trust between peoples.

The Soviet Delegation proposed to the General Assembly that all members of the United Nations should present to the Secretary General and the Security Council information regarding their troops on the territory of other members of the United Nations. In reply to this, as you are aware, came a statement by the United States Government. Mr. Austin, speaking at the General Assembly, stated that the United States of America would have no objection to this question's being discussed in the General Assembly.

He at the same time suggested broadening the question, and put forward two new proposals.

First, Mr. Austin proposed that information regarding troops of members of the United Nations should be furnished not only as regards territories of other members, but also as regards former enemy states. Second, he suggested that information should also be furnished regarding troops of members of the United Nations on their home territories. To both these questions the Soviet Delegation answered affirmatively, although its answer did not entirely square with the United States Government's proposals.

Let us consider the question of Allied troops on the territories of the former enemy states. This question is clear enough even without fresh details. The presence of Allied troops on former enemy territories was provided for in the relevant armistice terms. For this reason the Soviet Government did not see the basis for putting this question on a par with the question of the presence of Allied troops on the territory of another member of the United

Nations. Inasmuch as the armistice terms with each of the defeated states were signed, not by one, but by several Allied states, and were, in addition, published for general information, the basis upon which Allied troops are present on the territories of the former enemy states is known to all.

Furthermore, the Allies are now working out peace treaties. It is again clearly laid down in the peace treaties that, after their conclusion, Allied troops must be withdrawn from the territories of former enemy states within a definite, prescribed period. It is only in regard to Germany and Japan that work on the peace treaties has not yet been begun, for, as you know, sufficient reasons. But even here, matters are not at a standstill. So far as the peace treaties with Italy, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary and Finland are concerned, in all these treaties, provision has been made that the Allied troops must be evacuated from their territories within 90 days after the treaties come into force. There is complete understanding, therefore, as regards Allied troops on former enemy territories. Presuming that the submission of exact information on this subject would be of interest to the United Nations, the Soviet Government did not object to Mr. Austin's proposal.

Here, I consider it necessary to point out a misunderstanding which has crept in with regard to Mr. Connally's speech on the question of Austria. For some reason he spoke as if the American troops in Austria were there with the consent of the Austrian Government. But the Allies did not, in fact, ask the Austrian Government about this matter. When the Four Powers—the United States, the United Kingdom, France and the Soviet Union—concluded the agreement to move troops into Austrian territory, the Austrian Government did not even exist. This agreement clearly defined the zones of disposition for the troops of each Allied Power and also established Allied control of all Austrian territory, about which there is a special detailed agreement. Such are the facts of the situation.

Senator Connally made another remark about the state of affairs in former enemy territories.

He said that if the presence of Allied troops in friendly countries leads to interference in the domestic affairs of those countries, equally armies "in former enemy states were also capable of influencing the domestic affairs and policies of those states." In

this instance, Mr. Connally is perfectly right. Allied troops, however, are on former enemy territories expressly for the purpose of controlling the domestic affairs of those countries for a definite period. It is well known that the Allies, for instance, took a specific decision with regard to the democratization and demilitarization of Germany and agreed on the necessity for a prolonged occupation of Germany by Allied troops in order to implement that decision. As regards Japan, one of the chief aggressor states, it is natural that necessarily strict measures to control the domestic development of this state during a definite period will have to be instituted in order to ensure the demilitarization and democratization of this state as well.

Mr. Connally is, of course, aware that the Allies agreed that their troops should remain on the territory of Germany and Japan as well as on that of the other former enemy states in order to protect the important interests of the Allies and of all the members of the United Nations. But is it really right that we should apply the same standard to members of the United Nations as we consider necessary for former enemy states?

Finally, I must deal with yet another remark of Mr. Connally.

The Soviet Delegation proposed that the members of the United Nations should furnish information regarding their troops on the territories of other members of the United Nations, but not regarding Allied troops on former enemy territories. However, when the United States Government suggested that information on Allied troops on former enemy territories should also be demanded, the Soviet Delegation agreed. The furnishing of this information may perhaps help, even if only in the interest of getting more precise data. Inasmuch as this is considered desirable by other governments, the Soviet Government did not make any objection to this proposal.

But even when the Soviet Delegation had agreed to this proposal and introduced an appropriate clause into the text of its proposal, distributed to all the delegates present, Mr. Connally for some reason continued to urge this proposal and to reproach someone for not wishing to have this information supplied. It is not known why this was done, as there were no reasons for making such statements, but perhaps the proposal of the Soviet Delegation came to Mr. Connally's notice only after his speech and possibly

he did not hear my statement about our agreement to the provision of this information?

### III

#### The Aim of the Soviet Proposal

**I** WOULD like here to revert to a question which has already been raised by several delegates. The Soviet Delegation has been asked its aims in submitting its proposal. As this question has been repeated, I will deal with it again.

I must remind you again that in accordance with the Charter, the Security Council and its Military Staff Committee must prepare a proposal on the armed forces which should be available to the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace. This is provided for in Article 43 of the Charter. Questions of this nature have never been dealt with by an international organization before. Now, this task is on the agenda. The Military Staff Committee has already started to examine this question, though, of course, all the complications of working out such a problem must not be underestimated.

We must all help the Military Staff Committee in working out the plan of organizing the armed forces which must be available to the Security Council for the defense of general peace. But is it not clear that to do this the Military Staff Committee must have, for instance, data on the armed forces of the members of the United Nations outside the boundaries of their own countries and therefore wholly intended for purposes abroad? If the Security Council and its Military Staff Committee are not informed of the actual details regarding such troops, how can they work out the necessary plan for the armed forces of the United Nations? Only the possession of full information on these armed forces will permit the right plan to be worked out for the organization of the armed forces available to the Security Council for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

Mr. Bevin said yesterday that Article 43 bore no relation to the matter under discussion. But he took no pains to prove the correctness of his statement. The Soviet Delegation does not share this view. Its representatives taking part in the work of the Military Staff Committee consider it extremely important to have this

information for the working out of the plan of the organization of the United Nations armed forces. So far as I have understood in the course of the proceedings here, a considerable number of the delegates who have spoken here also share this view.

We should pay particular attention to the discussion we have had here. We have seen that individual representatives adopted different attitudes to the Soviet proposal. This is not surprising, if only because the proposal is a new one.

In the statement I made at the beginning of the discussion on this question, I gave, on behalf of the Soviet Government, a detailed account of the armed forces of the Soviet Union stationed on the territories of other members of the United Nations, and also on the territories of former enemy states, as this was provided for in the relevant armistice terms. Thus, the Soviet Government has put its cards on the table, as Mr. Connally suggested, and has shown what is the situation regarding Soviet troops abroad.

We heard the representative of France, who also dealt with this question. He explained the situation regarding French armed forces on the territories of other states.

We heard the statement of the representative of China. He recalled that China's troops had been in Burma and Indo-China during the war, and told us that when war came to an end all Chinese troops left foreign territories and returned home.

Thus, of the Five Great Powers, the Soviet Union, France and China have given us here an official account of the situation regarding their armed forces outside the boundaries of their states. Unfortunately, we have heard nothing on this matter from the representative of the United States of America, or from the representative of the United Kingdom. They have not given us this information, apparently because they consider it unnecessary to speak of these matters before representatives of the United Nations.

Of course we cannot demand that information on the troops of all members stationed on the territory of other members should be furnished to this particular Committee. Yet we have no reason to assume that the United States of America and the United Kingdom will refuse to furnish information regarding their armed forces stationed on the territory of foreign states, if the necessity for furnishing such information is acknowledged by the United Nations.

## IV

### The Reduction of Armaments—A Special Question

**I** WILL pass to a question on which different points of view have been expressed here, and on which we have not yet reached unanimity.

As we know, the Government of the United States has proposed that, apart from information regarding armed forces of members of the United Nations on former enemy territory, information should also be given regarding troops stationed at home. You also know that the Soviet Government does not object to this proposal. We consider, however, that this question should be examined when we deal with the problem of general reduction of armaments.

I am obliged to remind you that not only the question of the presence of the armed forces of members of the United Nations stationed on foreign territory, but also the question of general reduction of armaments has been brought before the General Assembly on the initiative of the Soviet Union. It is therefore obvious that when we consider the question of the general reduction of armaments, the general question of armed forces as a whole will arise, including the question of the armed forces which every state maintains at home. These are the views of the Soviet Government. Yesterday we heard yet another proposal.

The representative of the United Kingdom suggested that the question of forces of members of the United Nations on foreign territory should be discussed concurrently with the question of general reduction of armaments, including the question of troops maintained on home territories. It is not difficult to prove, however, that concurrent discussion would not be expedient.

It is clear to us all that both these questions are of great importance. We have no doubt that those who propose concurrent discussion of these questions also understand their importance, and would not wish to prejudice in any way the examination of either. Yet, while it is clear to us that the question of Allied troops stationed on foreign territory is by no means a simple question, and is one that requires serious discussion, the problem of the general reduction of armaments is even more complex. Concurrent discussion of these problems cannot be conducted without prejudice to the examination of the first as well as of the second question. If



we combine their examination, we shall not give the necessary attention either to the one or to the other. That is why such a combination would not be expedient.

It is not hard to see that these questions are also of a different nature.

When we say: give us information regarding your troops on foreign territory, we are speaking of an immediate question, we are speaking of the presentation of a factual picture of the present moment. But when we speak of the general reduction of armaments, we are speaking of a problem of larger dimensions, covering a considerable period. If the first question is mainly a question of facts, the second is above all question of principles, involving the complex working out of such problems as the participants at international meetings and conferences have hitherto been unable to solve.

No one can deny that the working out of the problem of general reduction of armaments will need a considerable time. Without profound study, over many months, it is impossible to discuss seriously the problem of the general reduction of armaments. Are we to believe that it is now proposed to postpone the furnishing of information regarding troops on foreign territory until we come to the end of our discussions on general reduction of armaments? Are we to understand the proposal for a concurrent discussion of these two problems to mean that the United Kingdom, the United States, the Soviet Union, France and other states will not be asked for information on their forces on foreign territory until the end of the working out of the problem of the general reduction of armaments? If that is so, such a decision will place us in an extremely difficult position. The inference may be drawn that in the meantime we do not wish to give information to the United Nations on our troops stationed on foreign territory, and we shall thus encourage a belief that we wish to maintain our troops on the territories of other members of the United Nations for a longer period. But you may judge for yourselves whether this will lead, and how it will be construed.

Finally, there is yet another consideration. If we agree to concurrent discussion of these two questions, and postpone furnishing information on troops on foreign territory until examination of the problem of the general reduction of armaments is complete,

we must also ask ourselves this question: Will such a decision produce the desired effect from the point of view of the authority of the United Nations?

## V

### Necessity of a Clear Answer

**I**T is obvious to all that no one will now dare openly to refuse to furnish this information to the United Nations. Such refusal would place any state in a position which would be very difficult to explain to the peoples. But we must not allow anyone to evade the question by not giving a straightforward answer. We must give an unequivocal answer to this question: Are we willing to furnish information about our armed forces on foreign territory or are we not? Any half-answer, or any attempt to evade the question, will affect the prestige of the United Nations, not to speak of the authority of the state adopting such a course.

In his speech here, the representative of El Salvador said that we should not concern ourselves with the problem of furnishing information regarding the armed forces of members of the United Nations on foreign territory, since the Security Council has not yet asked for such information. The attitude of the representative of El Salvador produced a somewhat strange impression. It is a convenient attitude for anyone who would like to avoid answering this question, but it is not compatible with the importance of the problem under discussion.

Indeed, this is already the third day we have been discussing this question, though the Security Council has not submitted it to us, and hitherto no one has protested against this. Consequently we have all acknowledged the necessity of such a discussion. Why did the representative of El Salvador not speak on the substance of this question, instead of evading a frank statement as to whether he considers the demand that such information be furnished to the United Nations to be justifiable? Whatever the case, if there is anyone among us who wishes to avoid a definite answer to this question, it seems to me that the majority will not agree to this.

After all these discussions, we must state clearly whether we consider such a proposal expedient, or whether we consider it inexpedient. It would be better that we should learn to speak frankly on such occasions. Let those who are against furnishing informa-

tion regarding their troops on foreign territory state so frankly, and explain their reasons. If any state defends the necessity of retaining its troops on foreign territory, the United Nations must know the reasons. In any case, evasion of a clear reply to the question will not satisfy many of us now.

The Soviet Delegation hopes that we shall reach a unanimous opinion on the question under discussion.

Insofar as this concerns the Great Powers, they must see in this their duty toward other nations. The importance of the role and the extent of the responsibilities of the Great Powers in the United Nations must impress them with the necessity of giving an affirmative answer to this proposal.

Such unanimity would be even more to the interests of the small states. The discussion of this question by the General Assembly must confirm the small states in the assurance that due attention is being given to the interests of their national independence and liberty.

The Soviet Delegation hopes that we shall reach unanimity in the decision of this problem. Such a decision must strengthen the authority of the United Nations and must answer the interests of peace and universal security.

## Speech of November 26

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen:

**O**UR discussion is drawing to a close.

The question of Allied troops on foreign territory has attracted great attention. Apart from the representatives of El Salvador and Argentina, no one here raised objections to the consideration of this question. I note with great pleasure, however, that the representatives of France, Poland, India, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia were definitely in favor of accepting the Soviet proposal. Other delegates moved their amendments to this proposal but nevertheless attached great importance to the question under discussion.

There were a number of points upon which we fundamentally agreed.

It can be said that in the general view the submission of the information in question will facilitate the fulfilling of Article 43 of the Charter. The possibilities for the work of the Military Staff Committee will thereby be considerably broadened.

The Soviet Delegation's proposal that information should be furnished regarding the armed forces of members of the United Nations on the territories of other members of the United Nations met with no opposition. I am not for the moment speaking of the reservations by which this agreement was qualified.

The Soviet Delegation in its turn accepted the proposal of the United States of America that information should also be furnished on Allied troops located in former enemy countries. It can be said that this proposal also received unanimous support.

No objection was raised either to the Soviet Delegation's proposal that information should be furnished regarding the location and the garrisons of air and sea bases belonging to the armed forces of any of the United Nations on the territory above mentioned. The receipt of this information will be extremely valuable to the Security Council.

Mr. Noel-Baker proposed that this information should be given

as of January 1, 1947, and not November 1 of the current year. The Soviet Delegation raises no objection to the British amendment.

Some delegates, however, propose that information be given regarding troops stationed at home in addition to the information regarding forces of the United Nations stationed abroad. This was insisted upon particularly by the representative of the United States of America, Mr. Connally. He was joined by Mr. Bevin and Mr. Noel-Baker in the name of Great Britain and also by some other delegates.

In this connection I am obliged to set forth the view of the Soviet Government on this subject.

I have already said that the Soviet Government considers it essential for the United Nations Organization to receive from member states complete information regarding all their armaments. But the Soviet Government is of the opinion that this question should be examined when we deal with the question of the general reduction of armaments which, incidentally, immediately follows the question under discussion on the agenda. The question regarding armed forces at home will, in that case, not only not be forgotten, but on the contrary, light will be thrown on it from all sides. Then the furnishing of the appropriate information will help in the solution of the most important political and practical problem presented by general reduction of armaments.

We have been told here that the United Nations Organization and its Security Council should be given all-embracing information on the armed forces of the United Nations. Senator Connally, with that interesting gesticulation which we all like so much, spoke very eloquently on this. Mr. Noel-Baker warmly defended the same thesis. Some other delegates, considering the proposal very attractive, also spoke in its favor.

What is in fact the proposal being made to us?

We are told that the question of providing information regarding armed forces of the United Nations on foreign territory is closely bound up with the problem of the reduction of armaments. In this connection it is stated, as Mr. Noel-Baker said yesterday, that the Soviet Delegation's proposal is too restricted and that it must be broadened. This broadening is taken to mean

that information must be furnished not only of troops stationed abroad, but of troops stationed in the interior of each country.

Let us examine the result of viewing the question from this standpoint.

If it is proposed that we link the question under discussion today with the problem of the reduction of armaments, then it is necessary to speak not only of troops, wherever they may be, but about all kinds of armaments. If we wish to link the question of troops on foreign territory with the general problem of the reduction of armaments, we must admit that information must be furnished not only regarding the total of military personnel on active service, including military-type formations, but also all kinds of armaments in each country. Consequently we shall then have to speak about jet-propelled weapons, atomic armaments, and all other types of armaments, in order to have that really comprehensive picture which some delegates here are making efforts to obtain. Is this what Mr. Connally and Mr. Noel-Baker want?

They are calling upon us to extend the question of submitting information regarding armed forces, and to demand, at the same time, information regarding armed forces stationed at home. But war is not waged with bare hands. As we know, types and number of weapons are all increasing rapidly in our time. In every country the question of armaments is decided not only on the basis of one or another force under arms, or of one or another number of naval or air forces, but also by the definite technical military means at their disposal, among which must be included the production of various forms of armaments, including the production of atomic armaments, flying bombs and others. The question arises: do those who insist on the extension of the question under discussion wish us to make the decision that each state should submit detailed information regarding all its armed forces and its armaments as a whole?

The Soviet Delegation does not object to demanding such information from all states, without any exception whatever. But it is obvious that such information may be demanded when we deal with the examination of the question of a general reduction of armaments. Then it will be essential for the satisfactory solution of the problem of a general reduction of armaments.

The Soviet Delegation does not consider, however, that the question under discussion should be broadened to such an extent as to be submerged by another wider problem. We consider that the question of the armed forces of members of the United Nations on foreign territory has an independent significance. It is connected with the execution of the tasks laid down by Article 43 of the Charter.

The problem of the general reduction of armaments is in no way connected with Article 43 of the Charter. As we know, this question is dealt with in other parts of the Charter. The problem of the regulation and reduction of armaments is mentioned in Articles 11, 26 and 47 of the Charter. We should obviously be acting rightly in implementing the provisions of these articles of the Charter. But this problem is of a special nature.

The submission of information regarding armed forces on foreign territory should be considered urgent, and a settlement of this problem should not be delayed until more complicated questions are examined, such as the general reduction of armaments. On the other hand, we all understand that the problem of the general reduction of armaments will require considerable time and immense work. To defer submitting information regarding armed forces on foreign territory pending the examination of the problem of a general reduction of armaments would be incorrect. This might be construed as an attempt to evade the settlement of an urgent question and as reluctance to submit this information, with regard to which delegates here have expressed such unanimous willingness.

Thus, the Soviet Delegation proposes that we end this discussion by adopting the decision on the submission by January 1, 1947, of information regarding armed forces of members of the United Nations stationed on the territories of other United Nations. The Soviet Delegation is in agreement with the amendment of the United States Delegation, with which the British Delegation also associated itself—that in addition to this, information should also be submitted concerning armed forces stationed in former enemy states. As for the question of armed forces stationed at home, this problem should be examined in connection with the question of the general reduction of armaments which we shall discuss tomorrow. In examining this question full information

should be submitted not only on all personnel on active service and on all armed forces but also on all armaments at the disposal of each of our states.

If we agree to this proposal, we shall not be delaying the decision of the urgent problem. At the same time, we shall be obliged at a later date to deal with the general problem of armed forces and armaments, with a view to carrying out the task of a general reduction of armaments.

When we deal with the problem of the reduction of armaments, we shall discuss the question of control over the reduction of armaments. The Soviet Delegation will then express its views on control, as, of course, will other delegations.

Gentlemen, you are acquainted with the proposal of the Soviet Delegation, which was submitted to you on November 20. I will not repeat it.

In view of the discussion which has taken place here in the last few days, the Soviet Delegation submits the following supplementary proposal:

"The General Assembly considers it necessary that all member states of the United Nations Organizations submit information regarding the armed forces and armaments on their territory, such information to be submitted when the Security Council comes to examine proposals regarding the general reduction of armaments."

If we adopt both the first and this second proposal of the Soviet Delegation it seems to me that we shall give a clear reply to the questions dealt with in the course of the debate.

It only remains for me to express the wish once again that this decision be taken unanimously.



