

ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS

29 WEST 57th STREET
New York 19, New York
PLaza 1-3850

Press Release #425
December 12, 1961
For Immediate Release



SECOND AND LAST DAY OF ACEN'S PLENARY MEETINGS
IN NEW YORK

Morning Session

The plenary meeting was presided over by Mr. Adolfs Klive, Latvia, who introduced the guest speaker, Ambassador Luis Valdes Larrain, Member of the Chilean Delegation to the United Nations.

- Albania
- Bulgaria
- Czechoslovakia
- Estonia
- Hungary
- Latvia
- Lithuania
- Poland
- Romania

Speaking in Spanish, Mr. Larrain said that he would urge his Government to propose the placing on the agenda of the next session of the UN the right of self-determination of the nine captive countries of Eastern Europe. He himself, he said, after his UN mandate was over, would seriously campaign in his homeland for the cause of captive Europe.

The Ambassador severely attacked the Soviet Union which, he said, speaks about freedom, but denies human rights to its subjects, and when speaking about independence, practices subjugation. In the UN, he said, now that African and Asian nations have obtained their freedom, this same right must also be applied to Eastern Europe. The free world has an absolute obligation to help those countries, he said, because it is obvious that those peoples are held down only by Soviet armies.

Memorandum to NATO Foreign Ministers' Meeting in Paris

The plenary assembly unanimously approved the following telegram to the Foreign Ministers of the NATO powers currently meeting in Paris:

ACEN...feels enjoined to speak up once again for the silenced peoples (of East-Central Europe) ...We must, above all, earnestly caution against the tendency to envisage a Berlin settlement at the price of a political agreement between NATO and the so-called Warsaw Pact or of some other kind of security arrangements which directly or by implication would sanction the subjugation of our nations.

The Warsaw Pact is not a voluntary association freely entered into by independent states. It is but a legal disguise for the Moscow-controlled Soviet imperial system. Equating this Pact with NATO and exchanging pledges of security with the oppressors of one hundred million Europeans whose right to self-determination the Western Powers are committed to uphold will have most serious consequences for the

cause of freedom. The hopes of the captive peoples would be dashed and their spirit of resistance shattered. The restraining effect of the hostility of our peoples to communism and Soviet Russia would be lost to the Western Powers at a time when no factor of deterrence is expendable. This would sharpen the dilemma in which the West is caught whenever Moscow decides to create a crisis: running the risk of an all-out war or making further concessions to the Soviets that would gradually undermine confidence in the effectiveness of NATO. Any agreement on Berlin secured at such a price would be a short-lived respite.

The peoples of East-Central Europe know that more than anyone the Soviet rulers have reason to fear a major war. They also know that forces of disintegration are at work within the Soviet Empire which can only be overcome to the extent Moscow maintains its winning streak and thus strengthens the myth of the inevitable victory of communism the world over. They therefore expect the West to deny purposefully to the Soviets further successes. In their view, by standing firmly on its present positions and by countering Soviet demands on Berlin or elsewhere with the demand for an over-all European settlement based on the right of self-determination, the West would set in motion within the Soviet Empire developments in the direction of both freedom and peace. They hope and pray with their spokesmen in exile that the leading powers of the forces of freedom will do so.

Debate on the International Situation and the Captive Nations

Mr. Stefan Korbonski, the first speaker, reviewed in depth the meaning of the de-Stalinization move by Khrushchev. He said it was obvious that the Soviet dictator was forced to take action to attempt a reconciliation between the party and the people. Also, because continued silence over Stalin's crimes and abuses has weakened the position of the Soviet Union in its international relations.

The Polish spokesman was very emphatic about the bloody role played by Khrushchev himself during the Stalin era. One proof of this is his complicity in the Katyn murder, since one of the camps where Polish officers were held was in the Ukraine, where Khrushchev was master.

* * * *

Mr. Bernard Yarrow, Senior Vice-President of Free Europe Committee, expressed the hope that the present obvious crisis in the Soviet Union will not be botched as in 1956 when the United States was not ready or willing to exploit a hopeful situation. He wished the free world would rid itself of its inferiority complex vis-a-vis Khrushchev. Khrushchev was not an innocent by-stander during the Stalinist era of terror, but the most willing and cruel executor of forcible collectivization in the Ukraine, where he was head of the Communist Party. Mr. Yarrow recommended the staging of a "show-trial" here in the United States against Stalin, with roles for a prosecutor and witnesses from the East-Central European countries. There was no doubt in his mind that by simply quoting from Khrushchev's adulatory speeches of Stalin and his writings during that era, he himself would be indicted as a criminal not less guilty than Stalin. Such

a show trial would attract the communications media of the whole world and would tend to convince the neutral and so-called uncommitted nations of the true face of communism.

* * * *

Mr. Vasil Germenji analyzed the Albanian situation, attributing Khrushchev's break of diplomatic relations with Tirana to his desperate effort to destroy the two Albanian "rebel" leaders — before their example might fatally affect Moscow's leadership within the Red orbit. The Albanian spokesman also emphasized that the rift between Peiping and Moscow is even more serious than reported.

* * * *

Mr. Sandor Kiss, Hungary, spoke of the 22nd Party Congress. He said that it has now become clear that the world Communist movement has lost its monolithic unity. Turning to Khrushchev, he said that he did not end, but only lessened the rule of terror inside the Soviet orbit. It also became obvious that Khrushchev cannot return to the former harsh Stalinist treatment of the Satellite countries. In order to counter the innate hatred of communism by the captive peoples, Khrushchev created crises outside the orbit to divert world public opinion from the problems of Eastern Europe.

Mr. Kiss also spoke up against concessions by the West to Khrushchev. He advocated a dynamic Western policy exceeding that of Moscow so that every opportunity might be exploited by the free world

* * * *

Mr. Augustin Popa said that the West has a new opportunity to seize the initiative in the cold war by skillfully exploiting the seeming confusion in the Soviet camp. For this purpose the free world should abandon its defensive attitude and all ideas of containment and concessions, which could only benefit the adversary in the long run.

Dr. Adolf Prochazka also spoke of the tensions in the Communist bloc, but warned against over-estimating the significance of the rift between Moscow and Peiping and the split between Moscow and Tirana.

Wishful thinking by the free world, complacency, relaxation of effort and a philosophy that evil would disappear by itself were erroneous tactics he said, and could result in accepting compromise solutions, thereby weakening the already weak Western positions.

Afternoon Session

The afternoon meeting was presided over by Mr. Stefan O usky, Czechoslovakia.

In the continuing debate, the first speaker was Mr. Adolf Klive, Latvia. In describing the Communist Party program he called it a propaganda trick aimed at appeasing the dissatisfied peoples in the Soviet orbit. In view of the low living standard of the peoples, he predicted Khrushchev's efforts will fail, due to the hostility of the peoples, the overwhelming majority of whom are opposed to Communism of any brand. In this respect he emphasized that not only the opposition of the hostile peasantry, the religious element, the deportees, and the youth, but

also the professed Communists themselves, who want a "genuine democracy in the Communist Party.

Mr. Josef Lettrich, Czechoslovakia, gave an analysis of the 22nd Communist Party Congress, explaining that de-Stalinization was invented by Khrushchev in order to smash his political opponents and to strengthen his hand "in his long struggle for Stalin's political and power heritage." He called Khrushchev a responsible party to Stalin's crimes, just as much as Novotny is in Czechoslovakia for Gottvald's crimes.

Mr. Nuci Kotta, Christian Democratic Union, limited himself to speaking of his homeland only. He said that he had no illusion about Hoxha's strength and ruthlessness. This Albanian Communist, he said, is a mass killer thoroughly trained by Moscow, who is too clever not to know that distant China cannot save him. So he must, he said, be hoping that the West will bail him out.

Mr. Kotta said that it was a pity that although his country was now free of Moscow, it was unfortunately not free of Hoxha and his communism. Mr. Kotta appealed to the West to help his people and abstain from helping Hoxha to perpetuate his rule.

Other speakers included Mr. George Petkoff, Socialist Union of Central Eastern Europe and Mr. Gyula Szentadorjany, International Peasant Union.

The International Situation and the Captive Nations

The Rapporteur, Mr. Vaclovas Sidzikauskas, introduced the Declaration asking that the captive nations issue "be raised on its own merit, as a matter of right, justice, international agreements, and enlightened self-interest on the part of the West; in other words, as an issue of a just and durable peace."

In conclusion, the Declaration appealed to the Western Powers asking them to discharge their responsibilities toward mankind and history by showing firmness and by answering the new Soviet assault on Europe with an overall peace program for that continent, based on the respect for the right of self-determination for the nations of East-Central Europe and by using all peaceful and legitimate means to implement such a program.