

## "SOVIET NEWS" BOOKLETS

REPORT OF THE POST-WAR FIVE-YEAR PLAN OF THE U.S.S.R. . . . .	1d.
SOVIET UNION AT THE POLLS: Election speeches by V. M. Molotov, G. M. Malenkov, N. M. Shvernik, K. E. Voroshilov, A. I. Mikoyan, March, 1950 . . . . .	3d.
J. V. STALIN ANSWERS PRAVDA CORRESPONDENT'S QUESTIONS . . . . .	1d.
SOCIALISM MEANS PROSPERITY—Results of the 1950 State Plan of the U.S.S.R. . . . .	1d.
SOVIET SPEECHES AT THE WORLD PEACE CONGRESS (Warsaw, November, 1950), by Alexander Fadeyev, Ilya Ehrenburg . . . . .	1d.
THE SOVIET UNION AT THE FIFTH SESSION OF U.N.O., 1950:	
September 20-October 23 . . . . .	3d.
October 26-December 12 . . . . .	3d.
PATRIOTISM AND INTERNATIONALISM, by S. Titarenko . . . . .	1d.
THE SOVIET UNION AND THE KOREAN QUESTION . . . . .	2s. 0d.
CONCERNING MARXISM IN LINGUISTICS (articles by J. V. Stalin) . . . . .	6d.
THE PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE OF THE CAPITALIST AND SOCIALIST SYSTEMS, by S. Titarenko . . . . .	1d.
THE SIXTEEN SOVIET REPUBLICS . . . . .	1s. 0d.
CONSTITUTION OF THE U.S.S.R. . . . .	3d.
FULFILMENT OF THE U.S.S.R. STATE PLAN FOR 1949 . . . . .	1d.
SOVIET LAND AND PEOPLE—A POCKET GEOGRAPHY OF THE U.S.S.R., by N. N. Mikhailov . . . . .	1s. 0d.
FALSIFIERS OF HISTORY (Communique by Soviet Information Bureau) . . . . .	1d.
STALIN'S POLICY OF PEACE AND DEMOCRACY . . . . .	2d.
THE TEACHINGS OF LENIN AND STALIN ON THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION AND THE STATE, by A. Y. Vyshinsky . . . . .	2s. 0d.
SPORT IN THE U.S.S.R. (1949) . . . . .	1s. 0d.
SOVIET MUSIC, by Boris Yagolin . . . . .	2d.

POSTAL SERVICE: Ten shillings covers our regular postal service, post-free, of each new title as issued, to the value of that sum.

Obtainable from Newsagents and Bookshops or direct from the Publishers,  
SOVIET NEWS, 3 Rosary Gardens, London, S.W.7

## THE SOVIET UNION IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

### A. A. GROMYKO

Speech at closing session of  
Conference of Foreign Ministers'  
Deputies, June 21st

### Y. A. MALIK

Speech on U.N. radio, June 23rd

## PRAVDA EDITORIAL

For a Policy of Averting War and  
Preserving Peace,  
June 24th

SOVIET NEWS

1d.

1951

Scanned / Transcribed by  
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus – London Bureaux

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/intro.htm>

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/english/home/index.php>



## "SOVIET NEWS" BOOKLETS

REPORT OF THE POST-WAR FIVE-YEAR PLAN OF THE U.S.S.R. . . . .	1d.
SOVIET UNION AT THE POLLS: Election speeches by V. M. Molotov, G. M. Malenkov, N. M. Shvernik, K. E. Voroshilov, A. I. Mikoyan, March, 1950 . . . . .	3d.
J. V. STALIN ANSWERS PRAVDA CORRESPONDENT'S QUESTIONS . . . . .	1d.
SOCIALISM MEANS PROSPERITY—Results of the 1950 State Plan of the U.S.S.R. . . . .	1d.
SOVIET SPEECHES AT THE WORLD PEACE CONGRESS (Warsaw, November, 1950), by Alexander Fadeyev, Ilya Ehrenburg . . . . .	1d.
THE SOVIET UNION AT THE FIFTH SESSION OF U.N.O., 1950:	
September 20-October 23 . . . . .	3d.
October 26-December 12 . . . . .	3d.
PATRIOTISM AND INTERNATIONALISM, by S. Titarenko . . . . .	1d.
THE SOVIET UNION AND THE KOREAN QUESTION . . . . .	2s. 0d.
CONCERNING MARXISM IN LINGUISTICS (articles by J. V. Stalin) . . . . .	6d.
THE PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE OF THE CAPITALIST AND SOCIALIST SYSTEMS, by S. Titarenko . . . . .	1d.
THE SIXTEEN SOVIET REPUBLICS . . . . .	1s. 0d.
CONSTITUTION OF THE U.S.S.R. . . . .	3d.
FULFILMENT OF THE U.S.S.R. STATE PLAN FOR 1949 . . . . .	1d.
SOVIET LAND AND PEOPLE—A POCKET GEOGRAPHY OF THE U.S.S.R., by N. N. Mikhailov . . . . .	1s. 0d.
FALSIFIERS OF HISTORY (Communique by Soviet Information Bureau) . . . . .	1d.
STALIN'S POLICY OF PEACE AND DEMOCRACY . . . . .	2d.
THE TEACHINGS OF LENIN AND STALIN ON THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION AND THE STATE, by A. Y. Vyshinsky . . . . .	2s. 0d.
SPORT IN THE U.S.S.R. (1949) . . . . .	1s. 0d.
SOVIET MUSIC, by Boris Yagolin . . . . .	2d.

POSTAL SERVICE: Ten shillings covers our regular postal service, post-free, of each new title as issued, to the value of that sum.

Obtainable from Newsagents and Bookshops or direct from the Publishers,  
SOVIET NEWS, 3 Rosary Gardens, London, S.W.7

## THE SOVIET UNION IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

### A. A. GROMYKO

Speech at closing session of  
Conference of Foreign Ministers'  
Deputies, June 21st

### Y. A. MALIK

Speech on U.N. radio, June 23rd

## PRAVDA EDITORIAL

For a Policy of Averting War and  
Preserving Peace,  
June 24th

SOVIET NEWS

1d.

1951

## THE PARIS CONFERENCE OF FOREIGN MINISTERS' DEPUTIES

### A. A. Gromyko's Speech on June 21, 1951

*A. A. Gromyko, Soviet representative to the preliminary conference of the Foreign Ministers' Deputies of the four Powers—the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A., Great Britain and France—made the following speech at the Deputies' session of June 21, 1951:*

**T**HE Soviet delegation has already repeatedly noted that the representatives of the United States, Great Britain and France, from the very beginning of the work of our conference, embarked upon a path of creating all kinds of obstacles complicating the achievement of agreement on what questions should be considered by the Council of Foreign Ministers. Our talks have lasted over three months. However, despite such a lengthy period, the questions to be considered by the Council of Foreign Ministers have remained unagreed.

Such a situation was certainly not caused by difficulties in finding important problems on the solution of which the fate of world peace depends, nor was it caused by difficulties in formulating one or another item of the agenda. The causes stem from the principles of the policy pursued by the United States, Great Britain and France. Compelled by the pressure of public opinion to agree to preliminary talks with the Soviet Union, the Governments of these three Powers have throughout our conference been opposing the inclusion in the agenda of the Council of Foreign Ministers of major problems with direct bearing on the strengthening of peace in Europe and on the improvement of relations between the United States, Great Britain, France and the Soviet Union.

## **I. The Soviet Government Initiated the Convocation of the Council of Foreign Ministers**

It is known that as long as eight months ago the Soviet Government addressed the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and France with a proposal for the immediate convocation of a session of the Council of Foreign Ministers to discuss the question of the fulfilment of the Potsdam Agreement on the demilitarisation of Germany.

In making this proposal the Soviet Government proceeded from the fact that already for a number of years the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and France have been flagrantly violating the Potsdam Agreement on the demilitarisation of Germany and that the question of the demilitarisation of Germany is of great significance for ensuring peace and security in Europe. It took the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and France four months to get ready to hold just a preliminary conference to prepare an agenda for a session of the Council of Foreign Ministers.

As is known, the Governments of the three Powers insisted on widening the range of questions to be considered by the four Foreign Ministers; they insisted that the Ministers should not restrict themselves to discussion of the question of the demilitarisation of Germany.

The Soviet Government agreed to the proposal of the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and France for the range of the agenda to be widened, stressing once more, naturally, that the policy of reviving German militarism, which the three Western Powers pursue, renders especially significant precisely the question of the fulfilment of the Potsdam Agreement on the demilitarisation of Germany and that this question should be given a place corresponding to its significance.

At the Deputies' conference the Soviet delegation proposed that the following items, having great importance for the strengthening of peace in Europe and for improving relations among the four Powers, should be included in the agenda:

- 1. Concerning the fulfilment by the four Powers of the Potsdam Agreement on the demilitarisation of Germany and**

on the prevention of the remilitarisation of Germany.

- 2. Concerning acceleration of the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany and, in conformity with this, concerning the withdrawal of occupation forces from Germany.**

- 3. Concerning improvement of the situation in Europe and the immediate beginning of a reduction of the armaments and armed forces of the four Powers—the U.S.S.R., the United States, Great Britain and France.**

- 4. Concerning the Atlantic Pact and the establishment of American military bases in Britain, Norway, Iceland and other countries of Europe and the Near East.**

- 5. Fulfilment of the Peace Treaty with Italy where it refers to Trieste.**

The three Powers, which throughout the conference have acted as a single bloc opposed to the Soviet Union, proposed another draft agenda including the following items:

- 1. Examination of the causes of the present international tension in Europe and the means to secure improvement in the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, Great Britain and France.**

- 2. Completion of a treaty for the re-establishment of an independent and democratic Austria.**

- 3. Problems relating to the re-establishment of German unity and the preparation of a treaty of peace.**

- 4. The peace treaties with Rumania, Bulgaria and Hungary.**

A mere comparison of these two drafts shows that whereas the Soviet Union put forward for the consideration of the Ministers the really important and urgent problems of ensuring peace in Europe and improving the international situation, the three Powers either entirely by-passed a number of these problems in their proposals or formulated the questions they raised in such a way that the formulations themselves belittled their significance. Thus, for instance, the item proposed by the three Powers on the causes of international tension in Europe and the means to improve relations among the four Powers is a general item which says very little, as became especially manifest subsequently when it became clear that the Governments of the three Powers had no intention whatsoever of discussing urgent questions directly bearing on the present tension in Europe and on the improvement of relations among the four Powers.

As discussion progressed it became obvious that their proposal concerning elimination of the causes of tension in Europe



and the improvement of relations among the four Powers is in fact an empty phrase only misleading public opinion.

This is also confirmed by the course of the discussion of such an item—indisputable, it would seem—as that concerning German unity and a peace treaty with Germany. The representatives of the three Powers stubbornly opposed the Soviet proposal that the necessity for **accelerating** this conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany and the necessity for **withdrawing occupation forces from Germany in conformity with this**, be indicated clearly in the corresponding item.

## **II. The Question of the Demilitarisation of Germany**

The Governments of the three Powers revealed their position to an even greater extent during the discussion of other important proposals introduced by the Soviet delegation. For instance, they came out with determined objections to the Soviet proposal concerning the demilitarisation of Germany and the prevention of the remilitarisation of Germany, striving to prevent the inclusion of this item in the agenda.

When the representatives of the three Powers were compelled to give their consent to the inclusion of a corresponding item in the agenda, they began resolutely to object to any mention of the Potsdam Agreement and to our formulation on "the prevention of the remilitarisation of Germany". All this was done, although at the Potsdam Conference the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and France had solemnly undertaken, in common with the U.S.S.R., to effect the full disarmament and demilitarisation of Germany and to prevent the revival of German militarism.

Striving to reach an agreed decision on the agenda, the Soviet delegation consented to change the formulation of this item accordingly and to exclude the reference to the Potsdam Agreement. Nevertheless, the delegations of the three Powers refused to consider the item on the demilitarisation of Germany as fully agreed and demanded that it should be given a secondary place in the agenda, after the item concerning a reduction of armaments and armed forces, which also remained unagreed.

This demand of theirs was not accidental. If we take into account the fact that the three Powers propose such a formulation of the question concerning the reduction of armaments as

does not lay the main emphasis on the task of reduction but on the question of the level of armed forces and armaments and its possible raising, it will not be difficult to understand then what end the representatives of the three Powers pursue when relegating the question of demilitarisation to a secondary place. They want to attach this question to that of the level of armaments and to subordinate it to the latter, an end they openly worked for, of course, at the beginning of the conference. They openly told us that the Governments of the three Powers were intending to continue taking measures for the restoration of German armed forces in Western Germany, retaining for themselves absolute freedom of action in this respect.

As a result of this, even now, when thanks to the efforts of the Soviet delegation the formulation of the corresponding item on the demilitarisation of Germany has been agreed upon, the question of its place in the agenda is nevertheless hanging in mid-air and has been left for the Council of Foreign Ministers to decide.

## **III. The Western Powers are Against a Reduction of the Armaments and Armed Forces of the Four Powers**

The same tactics of creating obstacles to agreement were also employed by the delegations of the three Powers during discussion of the above-mentioned Soviet proposal on the question of a reduction of the armaments and armed forces of the four Powers.

On March 5 the delegation of the U.S.S.R. submitted a proposal "concerning the immediate beginning of a reduction of the armaments and armed forces of the four Powers—the U.S.S.R., the United States, Great Britain and France". The representatives of the three Powers were against this formulation and insisted, firstly, that this formulation should say nothing about an "immediate beginning" and, secondly, that this item should be included in the general item on the causes of international tension in Europe, proposed by the three delegations, instead of appearing as a separate item.

In an effort to facilitate agreement the Soviet delegation met

the delegations of the three Powers half-way on this question, too, and submitted a new proposal. Our new proposal no longer mentioned an **immediate** beginning of a reduction of armaments and armed forces. Nevertheless, the representatives of the three Powers continued to object to the inclusion of this item in the agenda and sought to replace the question of a reduction of the armaments and armed forces of the four Powers by the question of the "level of armaments". Messrs. Parodi, Jessup and Davies have explained to us here what the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and France understand by "level of armaments" and what purposes they pursue when trying to replace the one question by the other. It is clear from their explanations, as we have already pointed out in our statement of May 10, that the Governments of the three Powers intend to continue the armaments drive in the future as well, and that the French Government, for instance, intends to raise outright at the Conference of Foreign Ministers the question of **stepping up** the "level of armaments" of France and that in general the Governments of the three Powers want to bury the whole question of a reduction of armaments on the pretext of the allegedly "inadequate level" of their armaments.

This is also seen from the fact that the representatives of the three Powers have categorically refused to accept the formulation on a reduction of the armaments and armed forces of **the four Powers**—the U.S.S.R., the United States, Great Britain and France. Instead of examining the question of a reduction of the armed forces of the four Powers, they prefer to speak about a general reduction of armaments, knowing very well that the four Powers cannot decide the question of the armaments of other countries. This shows that the Governments of the three Powers seek to prevent the Conference of Foreign Ministers from taking practical measures for a reduction of the armaments and armed forces of the four Powers and want to reduce the entire discussion to meaningless recommendations which would have "moral force" only, as was openly stated by Mr. Davies, and thus to doom the entire matter to failure in advance.

Not wishing to miss the last opportunity to ensure the convocation of the Conference of the Council of Foreign Ministers and to consider this question in substance, the Soviet delegation agreed that both the unagreed formulations of this question—the formulation of the Soviet delegation and that of the delegations of the three Powers—be referred to the Ministers for consideration.

#### IV. The Atlantic Pact and United States Military Bases are the Main Cause of Tension in Europe

Finally the representatives of the United States, Great Britain and France caused a crisis in the work of our conference and adopted a line obviously leading to breakdown when they categorically refused to include, even as an unagreed item of the agenda, the item on the Atlantic Pact and on the establishment of American military bases in Britain, Italy, France, Norway, Iceland and other countries in Europe and the Near East. By persisting in their refusal they revealed the actual intentions of the Governments of the three Powers. They showed that their statements about willingness to discuss the causes and effects of the tension in Europe and the improvement of relations among the four Powers were mere eyewash and that actually this was far from being the intention of the Governments of the three Powers.

The Soviet delegation submitted the proposal for the inclusion in the agenda of an item on the Atlantic Pact and the establishment of American military bases in a number of countries in Europe and the Near East precisely taking into consideration the fact that all the participants in the present conference had expressed their readiness to discuss measures for the improvement of the relations of the four Powers, namely the relations between the Soviet Union on the one hand and the United States, Britain and France on the other, as well as their readiness to discuss measures for the elimination of the tension existing in Europe.

Although the proposal for the inclusion of this item in the agenda was well founded, it nevertheless from the very outset met with resolute opposition from the representatives of the three Powers who stated that they would not even hear of the inclusion of this item in the agenda.

It is known that by the Potsdam decision the four Powers—the U.S.S.R., the United States, Great Britain and France—took it upon themselves to prevent a revival of German militarism, to ensure the security of the peoples of Europe and to prevent aggression on the part of Germany in the future. Now, however, the Governments of the three Western Powers form

a bloc with German militarists and *revanchists*, like Adenauer and the Hitlerite Generals Speidel, Manteuffel, Heusinger and other Hitlerite accomplices, prepare a military alliance with them and openly drag Germany into the North Atlantic grouping. All this is being done in contradiction to the vital interests of the European peoples, including the vital national interests of the German people who are concerned for the establishment of a united peaceful German State. This is proved among other things by the ever-growing movement in Germany against remilitarisation, a movement that frightens the *revanchist* Bonn Government which, on the bidding of its masters, has officially prohibited the People's Referendum in Western Germany against the remilitarisation of Germany and for the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany in 1951.

Negotiating with the *revanchist* Bonn Government the inclusion of Western Germany in the aggressive Atlantic grouping, the Governments of the three Powers take advantage of the fact that Western Germany has found itself dependent on them. While Mr. Davies, Dr. Jessup and M. Parodi are negotiating with us here on questions of improving relations among the four Powers, the three Western Powers are in every way speeding up measures, connected with the Atlantic Pact, for the remilitarisation of Western Germany and are thereby further aggravating the tension existing in Europe.

It is well known that, simultaneously with the work of our conference, negotiations were actually being conducted here in Paris and also in Bonn (Western Germany) by the Western Powers and representatives of the Bonn Government for the establishment of a regular West German Army headed by former Hitlerite generals and for the formation of a military alliance of the United States, Great Britain and France with Western Germany — an alliance directed against the U.S.S.R. and the people's democratic Republics.

During our conference an agreement of military and economic significance was actually signed here in Paris on the merging of the coal and metallurgical industries of Western Germany, France, Belgium, Holland, Luxemburg and Italy (the "Schuman Plan").

All the restrictions imposed on West German war industry by the quadripartite agreements on the disarmament and demilitarisation of Germany were also officially lifted.

By dragging Western Germany into the North Atlantic grouping, the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and France seek to utilise her material and manpower resources for their own aggressive purposes in order subsequently to drive the German people as cannon fodder to a new war being pre-

pared by the participants in the North Atlantic bloc.

According to press reports the Governments of the United States, Britain and France are now discussing the question of including Turkey and Greece in the Atlantic bloc. Indeed, this was officially stated not long ago by Mr. Charles Spofford, the American representative to the Council of Deputy Foreign Ministers of the Atlantic bloc, who suggested that the Council should study the question of admitting Greece and Turkey as full members of the Atlantic grouping. According to press reports, the same thing was said to the British Foreign Office by Mr. Gifford, the United States Ambassador to London.

When assessing the American demand that Greece and Turkey be included in the Atlantic bloc, the French press is already beginning to assert that this measure will "for strategic reasons compel the admission of Spain also" to the Atlantic bloc.

Thus with every passing day the schemes of the sponsors of the North Atlantic bloc are assuming the increasingly concrete form of the preparation of a new war. The real nature of the Atlantic Pact and of the measures taken by its participants is increasingly laid bare from day to day. Now it is no longer possible to conceal the fact that this pact has been converted into the main instrument of the aggressive policy pursued by the ruling circles of the United States, Great Britain and France. The armaments drive, the development of plans for the use of atom bombs, the construction of a network of American military, air and naval bases, the tremendous growth of military budgets, the extensive war propaganda and the fanning of war hysteria — all these are the results of the Atlantic Pact.

It was not accidental that recently, speaking at a meeting of the so-called National Policy Assembly in Arden, U.S.A., Senator Taft openly said that "the Atlantic Pact is a real military alliance, it develops the armaments drive and an armaments drive almost always leads to war".

In another speech he made on May 19 at a meeting of the Panama Canal Association Taft stated unambiguously that for the United States "it is cheaper to fight a war with soldiers of foreign nations, even if we have to equip them, than with American boys, and there is much less loss of American life".

Such are the plans of the American initiators of the Atlantic Pact for utilising the soldiers of foreign armies as cannon fodder.

Could there be any more outspoken statement as to the aims of the so-called American military aid rendered under the Atlantic Pact to France, Great Britain and other West European countries as well as to Western Germany? This statement deserves being made known to every man and woman in the North Atlantic bloc countries, including every French man and



woman. It shows what plans the American initiators of the establishment of this bloc connect with the rendering of such "aid". Their formula is simple: they are willing to supply the money and let the Europeans pay with their blood.

Are open admissions of this kind, made by the United States political leaders, not evidence of the fact that the Atlantic Pact and the creation of American military bases have nothing in common with the tasks of self-defence of the participants in this Pact who, as is known, are threatened by no one? Do they not show that this Pact is of an obviously aggressive nature, and far from helping to strengthen peace in Europe is, on the contrary, aimed at undermining peace, aggravates the tension existing in Europe and further worsens relations among the four Powers.

The facts go to show that it is the Atlantic Pact that causes the highest tension in Europe. Every day confirms the correctness of this statement. The facts show that feverish activities for the preparation of a new aggressive war are going on within the framework of this Pact. This finds its expression in the fact that the Atlantic Pact States are more and more inflating their war budgets, intensifying the armaments drive, piling up stocks of strategic raw materials, steadily increasing the size of their armed forces, and establishing more and more military bases and military strong-points. In the past two years alone the European participants in the North Atlantic bloc have practically doubled their war expenditures while the United States has more than trebled them. The armed forces of the countries who initiated this bloc—the United States, Great Britain and France—number over five million men and the size of the armed forces of these three Powers is being steadily increased. They are more than twice as large as the armed forces of the U.S.S.R. at the present time.

It is known that American diplomats, businessmen, generals and admirals are touring various countries of Western Europe and the Near East, trying by sops, intimidation and blackmail to get the consent of these countries to the enlargement of old American military bases and to the construction of new ones. It is no secret that the British Isles are assigned the part of one of the most important links in the chain of military bases with which the United States seeks to girdle Europe and the Near East. As is known, Britain has long been used as an American Air Force base. According to data widely published in the press there are at present at least twenty American military bases on British territory, the greater part of them located in the eastern areas of the country.

The United States is forming a chain of dozens of military

airfields in France, Western Germany, Iceland, Greenland, Italy, North Africa and the Near East. Much interest is displayed in the Mediterranean islands, as, for instance, the Balearic Islands, Corsica, Sardinia, Crete, Rhodes, Cyprus and others, which the American military call "unsinkable aircraft carriers".

The press publishes reports to the effect that at present the United States is negotiating for new military bases in Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Tripoli and French Morocco and that agreement has already been reached with the French Government on the establishment of seven American air bases in French Morocco.

Is it possible in the light of these facts to assert that all these military measures are of a "defensive" nature and pursue "peaceful" purposes? It is certainly impossible to do so without ignoring facts.

It is natural for the Soviet Union to wish to hear the opinion on this score of the United States, Great Britain and France at the conference of the Ministers of the four Powers and this explains why we made the proposal on the Atlantic Pact and American military bases. We cannot take seriously the statements of the representatives of the three Powers concerning the elimination of tension in Europe and improvement of relations among the four Powers if at the same time the Governments of the three Western Powers do not want to submit for the consideration of the conference of Ministers such an important question as that of the Atlantic Pact and American bases. Yet the representatives of the three Powers not only refuse to put this item on the agenda of the session of the Council of Ministers but also categorically refuse to refer it to the Council even as a non-agreed item (i.e. an item which must be decided by the Conference of Ministers itself—Ed.)

## **V. The Governments of the United States, Great Britain and France Bear the Responsibility for the Wrecking of the Conference**

This shows that in point of fact the three Powers do not want to eliminate the tension in Europe but want to preserve it for aggressive purposes. This means that they want to continue their policy of knocking together military blocs against the Soviet Union and the people's democracies, concealing their actions behind the screen of negotiations.

This is proved in particular by the following facts:

On May 31 the Governments of the three Powers addressed the Soviet Government with Notes in which they again tried to by-pass the most important question of the Atlantic Pact and American military bases in Europe and the Near East and to prevent discussion of this question at the conference of the Ministers of the four Powers. Even then it was obvious that by sending these Notes the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and France tried to torpedo the work of our conference and to prevent agreement.

In its reply to these Notes, given on June 4, the Soviet Government stated that it was of the same opinion as before, that the earliest convocation of the Council of Foreign Ministers of the four Powers to discuss the most important questions concerning the elimination of the tension in Europe and the strengthening of peace is necessary and useful.

The Soviet Government came out for the continuation of the work of the Deputies' conference to reach agreement on the agenda for the conference of Ministers and for including in this agenda the question of the Atlantic Pact and United States military bases as an item not agreed upon. The Soviet Government stated that a frank discussion of the question of American military bases and the Atlantic Pact, which was the main cause of the worsening of relations between the U.S.S.R. and the three Powers, would considerably relieve the tense atmosphere in Europe and facilitate the work of the conference of the Foreign Ministers' Council.

The U.S.S.R. Government also expressed readiness immediately to send its representative to a conference of the Foreign Ministers' Council in Washington as soon as the conference of Ministers' deputies in Paris had solved in a positive sense the question of including in the agenda the item concerning the Atlantic Pact and United States military bases.

Under pressure of public opinion the Governments of the three Powers were compelled to accept the proposal of the Soviet Government on carrying on the work of our conference. However, the whole subsequent conduct of the representatives of the three Powers at the conference showed that the consent of the three Powers to go on with the conference was not sincere. Since June 4 the representatives of the three Powers not only have not submitted any proposals which would facilitate agreement being reached on the agenda, but, on the contrary, continued blocking agreement as they had done before.

Instead of making serious attempts to facilitate such agreement being reached, on June 15 the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and France addressed new Notes to the

Soviet Government in which, as formerly, they again stipulated for the convening of the conference of Ministers the Soviet Government's withdrawal of its proposal concerning the Atlantic Pact and United States military bases, and raised the question of discontinuing the work of our conference. Thereby the Governments of the three Powers again proved their unwillingness to secure the convening of the conference of the four Ministers to discuss the most important questions of strengthening peace in Europe.

Proceeding as before, from the necessity to discuss at the conference of Ministers the urgent and imminent questions of maintaining peace and improving the situation in Europe, the Soviet Government naturally could not agree to the proposal for the discontinuation of the work of the conference of the Foreign Ministers' Deputies in Paris and to the attempts of the three Powers to by-pass the question of United States military bases and the Atlantic Pact.

In its Notes to the Governments of the three Powers on June 20 the Soviet Government, reaffirming its readiness immediately to send its representative to a conference of Foreign Ministers in Washington as soon as the Ministers' Deputies in Paris reached agreement on including in the agenda the item concerning United States military bases and the Atlantic Pact as an item not agreed upon, stated that it was necessary to continue the work of the preliminary conference so as to reach agreement on the inclusion of the aforementioned Soviet proposal in the agenda.

In its latest Notes the Soviet Government pointed out that it could not reconcile itself to a position in which, while all the items advanced by the three Powers are included in the agenda, the Soviet proposal on the Atlantic Pact and American military bases is rejected by the three Powers, as this would place the Soviet Union in an unequal position. The Soviet Government also pointed out that it has no objections to the discussion at the Council of Foreign Ministers of any mutual assistance pacts concluded by the Soviet Union with China, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Finland, and finally with France and Britain, if the Powers so desire.

Yet the Governments of the three Powers, continuing their obstructionist tactics, again refused, without any foundation whatsoever, to accept the Soviet proposal on the question of American military bases and the Atlantic Pact, thus taking the direct path of breaking up the Deputies' conference, as we were told frankly here by the representatives of the United States, Great Britain and France. This step on the part of the three Governments fully exposes the hypocritical nature of their

representatives' statements alleging that these Governments really seek the improvement of relations with the Soviet Union and the elimination of the tension in Europe.

In the light of these facts, reports in the American, British and French press which lay bare the plans of the three Powers for convening in the near future a conference of the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Great Britain and France deserve attention, and it is not even concealed that the preparations for such a conference have been conducted parallel to our conference.

Neither is it concealed that the object of the three-Power conference is the adoption of further measures by the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and France for the realisation of the aggressive plans of the Atlantic bloc, for the remilitarisation of Germany, the armaments drive, and the establishment of more and more American military bases in Europe and the Near East.

By refusing to refer to the Ministers the non-agreed item on the Atlantic Pact and American military bases the representatives of the three Powers show that their Governments had no serious intention of reaching agreement with the Soviet Union for the purpose of eliminating the tension in Europe and the improvement of relations among the four Powers, but that they pursue opposite aims—the aims of preparing another war.

## VI. Conclusion

The entire course of our conference has shown that the Governments of the three Powers seek to preclude the possibility of anything that could lead to a real improvement of relations among the four Powers, and in so doing they pretend not to understand what the issue is, not to understand why we do not agree with them.

The Soviet delegation has worked patiently to achieve agreement on the agenda. In so doing we proceed from the fact that the peoples of the world are not interested in general phrases and talk but practical measures for strengthening peace.

Our conference made it possible to elucidate the real attitude of all its participants on the most important questions affecting the situation in Europe. Following the directions of the Soviet Government, the Soviet delegation has for over three months been making efforts to reach agreement and has for this purpose met the delegations of the three Powers half-way on a number of important points.

Naturally, the Soviet delegation exposed the attempts of the Governments of the three Powers to secure a free hand for themselves in their policy of a further armaments drive, of the further militarisation of Western Germany, of knocking together military blocs and establishing more and more American military bases on foreign territories.

As for today's declaration of the delegations of the three Western Powers on the discontinuation of the work of the preliminary conference, it cannot be regarded other than as an act aimed at preventing the convening of the conference of Foreign Ministers.

It goes without saying that responsibility for the situation that has arisen rests with the Governments of the three Powers—the United States, Great Britain and France—who prevented agreement and sought to dictate to the Soviet delegation their own terms, to preclude the inclusion of a single important question in the agenda and to push through such formulations which would give them a free hand in continuing their policy of the preparation of another war for the benefit of the armaments merchants, of the American, British and French monopolists who batten on the blood of the peoples.

The course of the conference confirmed that the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and France are not working to relieve the tension in Europe but to aggravate it further. It is clear that the Soviet Union cannot be a party to such doings. As stated by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., Generalissimo J. V. Stalin, in his interview with a *Pravda* correspondent on February 17 this year, the Soviet Union "will continue unswervingly to pursue its policy of preventing war and preserving peace". The Soviet Government is convinced that this accords with the vital interests not only of the peoples of the Soviet Union but of all peoples.

## BROADCAST SPEECH BY

Y. A. MALIK

*The following is an English translation of the broadcast speech made on June 23 by Y. A. Malik, Soviet permanent representative at the United Nations, in the broadcast series "The Price of Peace" arranged by the United Nations Information Centre in New York:*

**I**T is quite obvious that the "Price of Peace" broadcasts should serve the cause of strengthening peace and help the forces upholding peace in their noble struggle for the prevention of war. The peoples of the whole world realise that peace is of the greatest value to mankind.

Six years have not yet elapsed since the termination of the Second World War, which cost millions of human lives, and the peace gained at such a high price is again endangered.

The ruling circles of the United States, Britain and France try to convince their peoples that in order to preserve peace it is necessary to arm, to create a so-called "situation of strength" which will allegedly make the outbreak of another war impossible.

It should be clear to everyone, however, that those who want peace must strive to settle the questions arising from relations with other countries by peaceful means.

The Soviet Government has repeatedly stated that the policy pursued by the United States, Britain, France and a number of other countries is thoroughly vicious, inevitably leads to new international conflicts and is fraught with the danger of another world war. It is precisely this policy of the Western Powers that has brought about the present serious tension in the international situation.

The establishment of the North Atlantic Military Alliance was the main cause of the deterioration of relations between the U.S.S.R. and the three Western Powers. Politicians of the countries participating in this bloc do not conceal that this military alliance is directed against the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democratic Republics. Suffice it to point out that day in and day out American newspapers and magazines publish maps and charts which represent the ring of American military bases in Europe and the Near East encircling the Soviet Union and show the

routes of American bombers' raids from these bases to industrial centres in the U.S.S.R.

At the preliminary conference of the Foreign Ministers' Deputies of the four Powers in Paris the representatives of the United States, Britain and France, as is known, have been in every way opposing the Soviet proposal for including the immediate question of American military bases and the Atlantic Pact in the agenda of the Council of Ministers called to examine all the most important problems of assuring peace. This stand taken by the Governments of the United States, Britain and France cannot but be regarded as an effort to keep up the existing international tension.

The conclusion of the North Atlantic Pact, the establishment of American military bases on foreign territories, the remilitarisation of Western Germany and the formation of West German armed forces, assistance in the revival of Japanese militarism, the frenzied armaments drive and the increase of armed forces in the member-countries of the North Atlantic group and primarily in the United States—such are the facts which characterise the aggressive policy pursued by the Western Powers now. The armed intervention in Korea by the United States and other countries dependent on the United States is a most graphic manifestation of this policy.

The Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and some other countries have repeatedly advanced proposals for a peaceful settlement of the Korean conflict. And if war still continues in Korea, this is only because the United States always thwarted acceptance of these peaceful proposals.

The seizure of Taiwan Island, which belongs to China, and the bombings of Chinese territory irrefutably attest to the United States' striving to extend the military conflict in the Far East. Experience has shown, however, that this may lead only to a further rallying of Asian peoples who justly regard such a policy of the United States ruling circles as a threat to their security and independence.

All the consequences of the policy of an armaments drive and the preparation of another war are felt by the peoples of the North Atlantic bloc countries. If, before the Second World War, in 1938-39, the annual military expenditure of the American Government was approximately eight dollars per head of the population, in 1950 the American Government's expenditure on war preparations reached 147 dollars per head of the population and in 1951 will grow to 307 dollars.

The only ones to gain from the armaments drive are those who obtain huge profits from deliveries of war materials. The *National City Bank Letter*, organ of the United States capitalists,

admitted that the United States economy "with every month ever more rapidly heads towards making armaments its main business and subjugating all civilian activity and the peace-time way of life to them".\*

In order to camouflage this policy of the armaments drive and the creation of centres of aggression the ruling circles of the Western Powers, try to present the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary and Bulgaria as aggressive and their own policy, which is really aggressive, as peaceful. These allegations are, however, refuted by facts which cannot be concealed. The Soviet Union has invariably upheld, and continues to uphold, the cause of peace and pursues a policy of co-operation with all countries which desire such co-operation. The Soviet Union threatens no one, and it does not and cannot plan any conquests. The peaceful policy of the Soviet Union proceeds from the basic principles underlying the Soviet social system and from the interests of the Soviet people. The efforts of the Soviet people are directed towards goals of peaceful construction. The Soviet State is engaged in developing civilian industries, building great hydro-electric power stations and irrigation systems on the Volga, the Dnieper and the Amu Darya, putting into practice the plan for the remaking of nature so as to ensure high and stable harvests.

The peaceful creative labour of the Soviet people in the post-war years has brought about a considerable rise in the living standards of the population. As a result of the increased wages, the systematic price reductions and the growth of state expenditures on social and cultural measures, the total sum of the incomes of factory and office workers and of peasants increased by 62 per cent in 1950 in comparison with the pre-war year of 1940. It is clear that such a scale of civilian construction and the considerable rise in the people's living standard would have been impossible had the Soviet Government pursued a policy of an armaments drive and the multiplication of its armed forces instead of a peaceful constructive policy.

Violating the United Nations' decision on the prohibition of war propaganda, hundreds of newspapers and magazines in the U.S.A. openly call every day for an attack on the Soviet Union. At the same time no one can name any Soviet newspaper that would call for an attack on the United States or any other country. Under a special law promulgated in the U.S.S.R. those who were to try to conduct war propaganda would be punished as major criminals.

In its policy the Soviet Government proceeds from the fact

\* Retranslated from the Russian.

of the peaceful co-existence of the two systems—Socialism and capitalism—and firmly adheres to the line of loyal, peaceful relations with all those States which manifest a desire for economic co-operation provided the principles of reciprocity and fulfilment of the obligations assumed are observed.

With regard to relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, as long ago as 1932, replying to a question of the American journalist Ralph Barnes, who asked whether it would be possible to create the conviction in the minds of the Soviet and American peoples that armed conflict between both countries should never under any circumstances occur, J. V. Stalin said:

"Nothing is easier than to convince the peoples of both countries of the evil and criminality of mutual extermination. But unfortunately questions of peace and war are not always decided by peoples. I do not doubt that the masses of the people of the U.S.A. did not want war with the peoples of the U.S.S.R. in 1918-19. This, however, did not prevent the Government of the U.S.A. from attacking the U.S.S.R. in 1918 (jointly with Japan, Britain and France) and continuing armed intervention against the U.S.S.R. up to 1919. As regards the U.S.S.R. it is hardly necessary to prove that the peoples of the U.S.S.R., as well as the Government of the U.S.S.R., want no armed conflict between the two countries ever to take place under any circumstances."

The Soviet Government has always upheld and continues to uphold a programme of strengthening peace and international security. This programme includes the co-operation of the great Powers, as expressed in the proposal for the conclusion of a pact for the strengthening of peace. The programme provides for a reduction of armaments and the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon with the establishment of international control over the fulfilment of this prohibition. It also provides for strict observance of the Potsdam decisions on the German question, for a peaceful settlement with Germany and Japan and for the expansion of trade and economic relations among all countries.

If this programme is not being carried out, it is only because it is not to the liking of the aggressive forces in a number of countries who fear that the realisation of this programme would undermine their aggressive measures and render an armaments drive impossible and, consequently, would deprive them of the possibility of obtaining new billions of super-profits from war orders.

The Soviet Union took an active part in the establishment of the United Nations. In so doing the Soviet Union proceeded from the fact that the strength of the international organisation is that it is based on the principle of the unanimity of the five great Powers' actions and the preclusion of isolation of any of

these Powers and that its actions will be effective only if the great Powers observe this principle. However, this principle is constantly violated, mainly through the fault of the United States Government, and three out of the five great Powers—the United States, Britain and France—systematically pursue a policy of isolating the two remaining great Powers—the U.S.S.R. and the Chinese People's Republic.

When setting up the United Nations Organisation, the peoples of the world hoped that this organisation would become a reliable instrument for maintaining international peace and security and would fulfil the obligations assumed under its Charter "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war".

Throughout the entire existence of the United Nations the Soviet Union has been taking steps aimed at strengthening this organisation by opposing each and every attempt by certain States, the United States in the first place, to by-pass the Security Council, which is entrusted with the main responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security, and to convert this international organisation into the tool of one or several States.

Through the efforts of the United States ruling circles, however, the United Nations Organisation is increasingly converted into an instrument of war, into a means of unleashing another world war and simultaneously ceases to be a world organisation of equal nations. The United Nations took an illegal decision which, *post factum*, sanctioned American aggression in Korea and China; the United Nations branded as an "aggressor" the Chinese People's Republic, which is defending its frontiers and is trying to regain Taiwan Island, captured by American troops.

The same follows from the illegal decision on an embargo against China and from the fact that 475 million of Chinese people are not yet represented at the United Nations.

The Soviet Union will carry on the struggle to strengthen peace and prevent another world war. The peoples of the Soviet Union believe that it is possible to uphold the cause of peace.

The Soviet peoples believe, too, that the armed conflict in Korea—the most acute issue of the present time—could also be settled. Readiness of the parties to take to the path of peaceful settlement of the Korean question is necessary for this. The Soviet peoples believe that as a first step the belligerents should begin negotiations for a cease-fire and an armistice with a mutual withdrawal of troops from the 38th Parallel.

Is it possible to take such a step? I believe that it is, provided there is the sincere desire to put an end to the sanguinary clashes in Korea.

I believe that this is not too high a price for assuring peace in Korea.

## FOR A POLICY OF AVERTING WAR AND PRESERVING PEACE

### "Pravda" Editorial

(Published on June 24, 1951)

**T**HE preliminary conference of Foreign Ministers' Deputies, which was held in Paris, has terminated its work, having failed to fulfil the task given to it—of drawing up an agenda for the Council of Foreign Ministers.

The conference stopped its work because on June 21 the representatives of the Western Powers announced the refusal of their Governments to continue the talks. The refusal of the Western Powers to continue the talks cannot but be regarded as an act directed at preventing the convocation of the Conference of Foreign Ministers.

There can be no two opinions about the fact that the responsibility for the situation that has arisen rests with the Governments of the three Powers—the United States of America, Great Britain and France. They are responsible not only for the breakdown of the Paris talks, but also for the growing tension in the international situation.

The entire course of the Paris talks and finally their breakdown have demonstrated that the Western Powers are not only not working to lessen the tension in international relations in Europe, as they hypocritically claimed to be doing, but on the contrary are striving still further to aggravate the present situation.

Compelled by public pressure to hold talks, the Western Powers, from the very outset of the preliminary conference in Paris, followed the line of putting every possible obstacle in the way of reaching agreed decisions.

The reason for the breakdown of the Paris talks is to be found not in the difficulties or impossibility of reaching agreed decisions, as the Western Powers try to make out in order to mislead public opinion. The true reason for the breakdown of the talks is to be found in the policy of the Western Powers, which is a policy of aggression and of unleashing a new war.

Alleging, in words, that they desire an improvement in relations with the Soviet Union and the other peace-loving Powers, in deeds they exert every effort to worsen these relations. Noth-



ing could more eloquently confirm this than the tactics of the Western Powers at the preliminary conference in Paris.

The Soviet delegation proposed for discussion by the Foreign Ministers' Conference really important and acute problems for ensuring peace in Europe and the improvement of the international situation. At the same time the three Western Powers put forward proposals which showed that the Governments of the Western Powers had no intention whatsoever of discussing urgent questions having the most direct bearing on the present tension in Europe and on the improvement of relations among the four Powers.

With their hypocritical phrases at the preliminary conference, the Western Powers did their utmost to mislead public opinion. The real position of the Western Powers was revealed in all its ugliness in the discussion of such concrete and important questions as the question of the demilitarisation of Germany, the reduction of armaments, and particularly the question of the Atlantic Pact and American military bases.

With a persistence worthy of a better cause, the Western Powers did their utmost to prevent the inclusion in the agenda of the question of the demilitarisation of Germany and the prevention of the remilitarisation of Germany. This despite the fact that, as is known, the United States, Britain and France had signed the Potsdam Agreement binding these Powers, jointly with the U.S.S.R., to carry out the demilitarisation of Germany, and to prevent the resurgence of German militarism.

The crux of the matter is that the Western Powers, flagrantly violating the Potsdam Agreement, are speeding up the remilitarisation of Western Germany and do not wish to renounce this policy which has nothing in common with the cause of peace and security in Europe.

With similar stubbornness and persistence the Western Powers opposed the inclusion in the agenda of the question of the reduction of armaments, attempting to put in the place of this question the formula of the so-called "level of armaments". In so doing the Western Powers pursued a direct aim—to ensure for themselves the possibility of continuing the feverish arms drive which they are now pursuing.

The double game played by the representatives of the Western Powers was exposed during the discussion of the question of including in the agenda the item concerning the Atlantic Pact and United States military bases. The Western Powers categorically refused to include this question in the agenda, even as an unagreed item. They created a crisis in the work of the Paris conference and brought the negotiations to a breakdown.

The stand taken by the Western Powers on the question of the

Atlantic Pact and United States military bases more than anything else exposes their policy directed at preparing a new war.

The Soviet delegation submitted the proposal that the item concerning the Atlantic Pact and United States military bases be included in the agenda because it is precisely the Atlantic Pact which is the chief cause of the tension in Europe. It is precisely on the basis of the Atlantic Pact that the remilitarisation of Western Germany and the resurgence of German militarism are being accomplished.

The Governments of the Western Powers are negotiating with the *revanchist* Bonn Government the inclusion of Western Germany in the aggressive Atlantic grouping. This fact alone speaks with sufficient eloquence to the falseness of the assertions of the Western Powers that the Atlantic Pact ostensibly pursues "defensive" aims.

It is obvious to the whole world that the Atlantic Pact is an instrument of the aggressive policy of the ruling circles of the United States and Britain. It is precisely on the basis of this self-same Atlantic Pact, which its sponsors are doing their utmost to extend more and more widely by the proposed inclusion of Turkey, Greece and Spain, that an unprecedented arms drive is being carried out, war budgets are being more and more inflated, strategic raw materials are being stock-piled, the strength of the armed forces of the countries of the Pact is being increased and more and more military bases and strongholds are being established.

It goes without saying that without a discussion of the question of the Atlantic Pact and United States military bases, the Conference of Foreign Ministers would be unable to promote an improvement in the relations among the four Powers. The Western Powers' refusal to include in the agenda of the Conference of Foreign Ministers the question of the Atlantic Pact and American military bases clearly proves that they do not want any improvement in relations, that their assurances on this score are utterly false and hypocritical and that their policy is a policy of aggression and the thwarting of international co-operation.

The Western Powers do not want the Atlantic Pact discussed because they fear public opinion, they fear publicity, they fear the light of day that would lay bare their aggressive and criminal designs directed against peace and the security of the nations. No truly peaceful policy fears the light or the judgment of public opinion. The Soviet Government itself proposed discussion by the Foreign Ministers' Conference of all the treaties of friendship and mutual aid which the Soviet Union has concluded with China, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Finland and, finally, with France and Great Britain.

The Western Powers turned down the Soviet proposal. They retreated in a cowardly way, preferring the breakdown of the talks to the open discussion of questions.

The peace-loving peoples, the supporters of peace throughout the world will know how to draw conclusions from the instructive lessons of the Paris talks. The tactics of the Western Powers at the preliminary conference in Paris have proved once again that the leaders of the American-British imperialist bloc, assiduously preparing for the realisation of their aggressive designs, at the same time endeavour to enmesh the masses of the people in lies, to deceive them and to draw them into a new world war.

The fighters for peace are inspired by Comrade Stalin's words that peace will be preserved and strengthened if the peoples take into their own hands the cause of the preservation of peace and defend it to the end.

The Paris talks have supplied the world with fresh proof of the consistent and persistent policy of struggle for peace which is carried out by the Soviet Government with the unanimous support of the whole of the Soviet people.

The Soviet Union will continue in the future unswervingly to pursue the policy of preventing war and preserving peace. This policy corresponds to the fundamental interests, not only of the peoples of the Soviet Union, but of all peace-loving peoples.

# SOVIET WEEKLY

*The Only Soviet Illustrated Journal  
Published in Great Britain*

---

*Every Thursday*

**3d.**

---

## SPEECHES

and STATEMENTS  
of international importance.

## ARTICLES

by leading Soviet writers  
and journalists.

## SELECTIONS

from Soviet Literature.

## PICTURES

taken by our photographers  
in all parts of the U.S.S.R.

## SPORT

*From all newsagents, booksellers or direct from  
3 ROSARY GARDENS, LONDON, S.W.7*

---

Published by "Soviet News", 3 Rosary Gardens, London, S.W.7, and  
printed by Farleigh Press Ltd. (T.U. all depts.), Watford, Herts

Subscriptions: 4/4 per quarter; 8/8 half year; 17/4 year