

★ NEWS FROM THE LAND OF  
PEACE AND CONSTRUCTION

To keep abreast of developments in the Soviet Union, where such great economic and social changes are taking place,

Read **SOVIET WEEKLY**

Each week *Soviet Weekly* gives you the latest news of the Soviet people at work and play, and of Soviet policy for preserving peace.

FOR THE TRUTH ABOUT  
THE

**Soviet  
Weekly**

U.S.S.R.

Obtainable from your  
newsagent or bookseller,  
each Thursday, price 3d.,  
or by postal subscription,  
see form below.

To: SOVIET WEEKLY,  
3 ROSARY GARDENS, LONDON, S.W.7

- Please find enclosed 4/4 for 3 months; 8/8 for 6 months; 17/4 for 12 months; being my subscription to Soviet Weekly.
- Please send me specimen copy and further information.  
(cross out what does not apply).

Name .....

Address .....

(block letters)

16

# What is the Meaning of the Washington Conference?

‘Pravda’ Editorial

A ‘SOVIET NEWS’ BOOKLET

**One Penny**

23 July 1953

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>



Published by  
SOVIET NEWS  
3 Rosary Gardens  
London, S.W.7.

# What is the Meaning of the Washington Conference?

*'Pravda' Editorial*

(Published on July 23, 1953)

RECENTLY a five-day conference of the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Britain and France ended in Washington. In their final communiqué the participants in the conference alleged that they had striven to realise the "hope of their governments and peoples for peace, freedom and justice." The results of the negotiations, however, show that the words about peace, freedom and justice are used here for entirely different purposes.

The Washington communiqué shows that the conference of the three Ministers has not advanced any single one of the burning questions of international relations. As to the question of an armistice in Korea and the question of relations with the People's Republic of China, one cannot but note that under the pressure of Mr. Dulles, both the British representative, Lord Salisbury, and the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, M. Bidault, retreated. Lord Salisbury and M. Bidault agreed in reality to support the adventurer Syngman Rhee, who is subservient to the American military, in the event of his taking it into his head to hinder the armistice and to launch a new adventure. At the same time, against their vital interests, Britain and France have agreed to continue

the trade blockade of China after an armistice in Korea, and to hold up the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations Organisation.

At the same time, one cannot but note that the Washington conference took place in an atmosphere of internal differences of opinion and deepening contradictions between the United States and its allies. This concerns above all the main question with which those taking part in the conference were preoccupied—the question of the position to be adopted by the western powers in the face of insistent, ever widening demands for the settlement of disputed international problems by means of negotiations and for the achievement of a relaxation of the tension in the international atmosphere. In these days such demands are increasing and are assuming ever greater weight, to the extent that the consistent peace-loving foreign policy of the U.S.S.R. is overthrowing, one after another, the obstacles the enemies of international co-operation are placing along the road to the settlement of disputed international problems.

What is the meaning of the very fact of the Washington conference of the three Ministers, without the participation of a representative of the U.S.S.R.? It shows above all that those taking part in the conference did not wish to consider elementary international rules and customs. If the governments of the United States, Britain and France really want to discuss some problems or other of international relations with the government of the U.S.S.R., then there is a normal road to this, in accordance with usual international customs. Nobody can declare it to be a normal state of affairs when a conference of the representatives of four countries is preceded by collusion among the representatives of three of the states, and even by an attempt to impose on the subsequent quadripartite conference both a time limit and an agenda, adopted without the participation and behind the back of the representative of one of the four states.

Such a state of affairs can hardly be regarded as normal in the preparation of a conference of the representatives of the four states. And it can hardly be claimed that if, for instance, a conference of the representatives of the four powers should

take place later, the hands of the representatives of Britain and France would not prove to be tied in some way.

The American Press reveals that the U.S. Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, intended to persuade the representatives of Britain and France to shelve the idea of negotiations, if not to abandon them altogether, and to intensify the notorious American "cold war," i.e. the policy of diversions, adventures and provocations against the countries of the democratic camp, an example of which is the sorties organised by foreign hirelings in Berlin on June 17.

Judging from Press reports, Lord Salisbury and M. Bidault replied to this by stating that their governments would find themselves at present in a difficult position if they abandoned the idea of quadripartite negotiations and followed the course proposed by the United States, since, in their countries, this course was meeting with growing resistance. They pointed out that Sir Winston Churchill's well-known proposal for the immediate holding of "a conference on the highest level," with the participation of the U.S.S.R., for the purpose of discussing and solving disputed international problems, was dictated by a sober estimate of the international situation, and corresponded to the demands of wide sections of the population of the West European countries. Moreover, they could not but admit that the ignoring of these demands and the further carrying through of the pro-American policy on this issue would lead to the most serious internal complications in Western Europe.

It is not by chance that even the *Wall Street Journal*, a mouth-piece of influential American industrial circles, was compelled to state: "The general opinion which apparently is held by French and British official personages is that their people want this conference, that they insist on it and, should such a conference not be convened, they will not only be unable to attain even a little as regards concrete actions of the cold war, but will be removed from power."

Such arguments, the paper says, compelled Mr. Dulles to agree to the holding of quadripartite negotiations with the participation of the U.S.S.R., although he opposed such a proposal, using "all arguments known to him."

Thus it was not love of peace but fear of the complete

exposure of their policy, directed against international co-operation, which compelled the ruling circles of the United States, Britain and France to make concessions to the demands of the masses of the people, who approve and support demands for the settlement through negotiations of unsolved international problems.

Having agreed to this concession to the demands of the public, however, American diplomacy, supported by its British and French partners, spared no efforts in order to use the decision only recently adopted in Washington, not for a genuine settlement of vitally important international problems, but for their own particular aims, which have nothing in common with the tasks of easing international tension.

Mr. Dulles, who often reflects the sentiments of the extreme reactionary circles, has here too been able, in some measure, to achieve his aims. Under pressure from the United States, the representatives of Britain and France retreated from the idea of joint negotiations of the heads of the four governments, which is a step backward as compared with the proposal put forward earlier by Sir Winston Churchill, and supported by public opinion in Britain and France.

The Washington communiqué made yet another withdrawal from previous positions. This communiqué is an attempt to narrow down the tasks of the quadripartite conference, by limiting it solely to a few questions appertaining to Germany and Austria. The impression is being created that the participants in the Washington conference wish to circumvent, or even consider it possible to ignore, the main problem—the problem of relaxing the tension in international relations.

In essence, the participants in the Washington conference reduced the matter to the reiteration of the contents of the notorious Note of the United States, Britain and France, sent to the Soviet Union as long ago as September 23, 1952. As we know, in this Note one of many attempts was made to narrow down hopelessly the German problem, and to reduce the entire question to the holding of all-German elections, which the western powers expect to put under their control, while giving a free hand to all the reactionary and even openly fascist elements throughout the whole of Germany.

The authors of the communiqué allow it to be clearly understood that these short-sighted calculations have once more appeared among them, in connection with the Berlin adventure of June 17, on which not a few American dollars from the well-known hundred million dollar fund, earmarked for financing all kinds of diversions, espionage, terror and criminal offences, were spent.

The participants in the Washington conference pretended that they wish to examine the German problem and the Austrian question at a conference of the Foreign Ministers of the four powers. In reality, however, the Washington communiqué does not at all bear witness to an attempt to advance the settlement of these current questions.

The participants in the Washington conference spoke, for instance, about the German problem, but not at all in order to help to solve the fundamental questions connected with it. They keep silent about the fact that, owing to the fault of the United States, Britain and France, not only the solution, but also the discussion of the question of the peace treaty with Germany has been held up until now. They touch in passing upon the problem of the unification of Germany, but it can be seen that the Washington conference was not concerned with the unification of Germany, or the speeding up of the matter of the formation of an all-German government. Just as in 1952 and in previous years, they reduced the matter to new talks about all-German elections, only in order to delay the solution of the questions of a peace treaty for Germany, and of the uniting of the German people into a single state.

It appears that they have not, and cannot have in mind the question of the speediest unification of Germany and the conclusion of a peace treaty, since for them the German problem amounts above all to the strengthening of the power of the Adenauer clique in the western part of Germany, where this clique's days of power are perhaps already numbered. They cannot but see that the change of sentiments of the Germans in Western Germany does not go in favour of Adenauer and his fascist *revanchist* clique, and

that, even tomorrow, social democracy might replace Adenauer. They are faced with the question of how to support and how to strengthen the domination of the Adenauers, tied to the American chariot, who are becoming more and more hated by the German people.

On September 6, parliamentary elections are to be held in the Bonn republic, when the population of Western Germany can throw the Adenauer clique out of the government. In view of this, Adenauer's protectors have to make haste. Things have gone so far that even the French Minister of Foreign Affairs was compelled in Washington to pledge his readiness to support the Adenauer clique, the entire essence of whose existence amounts to reviving German imperialism and the re-establishment, in one form or another, of the Hitlerite "Wehrmacht."

It is not by chance that the Washington document openly emphasises the endeavour of the three powers to continue their efforts aimed at carrying out the plan to set up a "European army," providing for the remilitarisation of Western Germany and her inclusion in the aggressive Atlantic bloc. On the other hand we know that the Bonn treaty, the ratification of which is at present strongly urged by the United States, provides that, in the event of the unification of Germany, she should assume all the international obligations accepted by the West German government, naturally including also the obligation with regard to participation in the "European army."

Everybody knows of these plans which are aimed at making Germany become once more a militarist state. The intention is to make the armed forces of Germany the basis of the "European army," the spearhead of the aggressive North Atlantic alliance. If these plans for the whole of Germany should be carried out, then, as everybody appreciates, they would result in the unleashing of the most warlike militarist forces in the centre of Europe, and in the revival of the same kind of hotbed of war as was the case only recently with Hitlerite Germany.

In this connection, one's attention is attracted by the fact that the West European bourgeois Press reproaches the participants in the Washington conference with the primitive nature

of the manoeuvre they have worked out. Mr. R. H. S. Crossman, a member of the Labour Party, writes in a British newspaper, the *Sunday Pictorial* :

"... Mr. Molotov is invited to attend a Foreign Ministers' conference on Germany at the end of September; and he is told in advance that, whatever proposals he makes, the three western powers will not budge from their decision to rearm Western Germany.

"In fact, our response to the Kremlin's peace overtures is the cool proposal that the Russians should withdraw from their zone and permit a united rearmed Germany to become a full member of the Atlantic defence system."

Having stressed that, by putting the question in such a way, one can only bring about a breakdown of negotiations, Mr. Crossman concludes :

"That, in my view, is precisely why it has been put forward. Compelled to have a conference that he does not want, Mr. Dulles has been careful to ensure in advance that it will fail."

The West European Press does not conceal the fact that the American organisers of the Washington conference do not in reality even dream about a real solution of the German problem. They needed the hullabaloo around the German problem only in order to divert the attention of the German people and to force them to believe the allegation that American ruling circles and their creature Adenauer are playing the part of defenders of the interests of Germany, and in this way to strengthen the shaky position of the Adenauer clique.

All this bears witness to the fact that the Washington communiqué was dictated, not by a desire to solve the German problem, but by the definite striving of American ruling circles to maintain Adenauer in power and, in a bloc with the Adenauer clique, to ensure that all the material and human resources of Western Germany are placed at the service of aggressive aims.

Whereas earlier, American propaganda attempted to compel the French to agree to the setting up of a "European army," by intimidating them with an imaginary "Soviet threat," today nobody believes any longer in the fables of this threat. And it



is not by chance that even Mr. Dulles, in his speech on an American television programme on July 17, did not dare to launch this hackneyed and false argument. He expressed profound regret that such an "essential step"—so he asserted—as the setting up of the "European Defence Community," i.e. the setting up of the so-called "European army," was being retarded.

Mr. Dulles declared:

"To our disappointment Parliaments have delayed the acceptance of this step.

"Some evidently think that the European Defence Community has no other object than to rebuff the threat from the Soviet Union; therefore, if this threat should lessen, then in their opinion there would be no necessity for the existence of the community." In contradiction to this, Mr. Dulles has now begun to argue that "the main reason for the creation of the European unity is the fact that the absence of unity has for 150 years been a source of wars" among European states.

All this shows clearly that the United States is intensifying its pressure in order to speed up the creation of a "European army" headed by the German "Wehrmacht." Since it has become impossible to refer to some kind of "threat" from the U.S.S.R., new arguments are being hastily thought up in order to prod the West European Parliaments to vote for the creation of that army.

For the same purpose, new attempts are being made to strengthen Adenauer's weakened position in Western Germany. It is only in this connection that it becomes clear why the Washington conference has embarked on talks on the German problem, although it refuses to deal either with the preparation of a peace treaty with Germany, or with practical steps for the formation of an all-German government, aimed at securing the reunification of Germany without further delay.

On the one hand, the Washington conference spoke in favour of the calling of a conference of the Foreign Ministers of the U.S.S.R., the United States, Britain and France, which, under definite premises, could have an important positive significance. On the other hand, it is proposed to use this

very conference of the representatives of the four powers for purposes which have nothing in common with the interests of strengthening peace, and which have nothing in common with the tasks of relaxing the tension in international relations. A profound divergence between the declarations and the real intention of the participants of the Washington conference has manifested itself with the utmost clarity.

What, therefore, is the meaning of the Washington conference?

The conference bears witness to the fact that nobody now can any longer deny the burning need to settle urgent international problems by means of negotiations.

At the same time, the Washington conference and the communiqué which was issued following it, show how great are the obstacles still standing in the path of solving these problems by achieving real agreements among the states concerned.

To overcome these obstacles and thus contribute to a *détente* in international relations—that is the task.