

## **'SOVIET NEWS' BOOKLETS**

### **New Paths of Soviet Science**

Notes on the latest research of Soviet  
scientists by Oleg Pisarzhevsky 6d.

### **Higher Education in the U.S.S.R.**

by I. G. Petrovsky, Rector of Moscow State  
University and member of the U.S.S.R.  
Academy of Sciences 6d.

### **Education in the U.S.S.R.**

by Prof. Y. N. Medynsky, member of the  
Academy of Educational Sciences of the  
R.S.F.S.R. (2nd Ed. revised.) 6d.

### **The U.S.S.R.—100 Questions Answered**

New revised edition—questions most fre-  
quently asked by British and other visitors  
to the U.S.S.R. 1/6d.

### **Soviet Women**

by O. Vinogradova 3d.

### **Creative Freedom and the Soviet Artist**

by Marietta Shaginyan, Stalin Prize winning  
author 3d.

### **Working Conditions in Soviet Industry**

Questions and answers on conditions of  
labour in Soviet industry 2d.

### **Freedom of Religion in the U.S.S.R.**

by G. Spasov 2d.

### **Speech by G. M. Malenkov to the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet**

April 26, 1954 1d.

**Subscription Service:** For the deposit of 10/- or a smaller  
amount we will send you post free a copy of each new  
"Soviet News" Booklet as it appears

Soviet News, 3 Rosary Gardens, S.W.7

# **EUROPEAN SECURITY**

## **THE SOVIET PLAN**

DMITRI MELNIKOV

One Penny

1954

492

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**

### **New Paths of Soviet Science**

Notes on the latest research of Soviet  
scientists by Oleg Pisarzhevsky 6d.

### **Higher Education in the U.S.S.R.**

by I. G. Petrovsky, Rector of Moscow State  
University and member of the U.S.S.R.  
Academy of Sciences 6d.

### **Education in the U.S.S.R.**

by Prof. Y. N. Medynsky, member of the  
Academy of Educational Sciences of the  
R.S.F.S.R. (2nd Ed. revised.) 6d.

### **The U.S.S.R.—100 Questions Answered**

New revised edition—questions most fre-  
quently asked by British and other visitors  
to the U.S.S.R. 1/6d.

### **Soviet Women**

by O. Vinogradova 3d.

### **Creative Freedom and the Soviet Artist**

by Marietta Shaginyan, Stalin Prize winning  
author 3d.

### **Working Conditions in Soviet Industry**

Questions and answers on conditions of  
labour in Soviet industry 2d.

### **Freedom of Religion in the U.S.S.R.**

by G. Spasov 2d.

### **Speech by G. M. Malenkov to the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet**

April 26, 1954 1d.

**Subscription Service:** For the deposit of 10/- or a smaller  
amount we will send you post free a copy of each new  
"Soviet News" Booklet as it appears

Soviet News, 3 Rosary Gardens, S.W.7

# **EUROPEAN SECURITY**

## ***THE SOVIET PLAN***

DMITRI MELNIKOV

**One Penny**

1954

492

# EUROPEAN SECURITY

## The Soviet Plan

*by*

DMITRI MELNIKOV

Published by "Soviet News", London, 1954

## *Foreword*

**I**T is impossible to give an exact estimate of the sacrifices suffered by mankind in numerous devastating wars in Europe. But those sacrifices were tremendous. The two world wars of the twentieth century alone carried off some 60 million lives.

The forces which propel the peoples towards the abyss of another disaster are active again today. Closed military groups are being created, just as before the Second World War.

An arms drive is under way. Propaganda for the "policy of strength" is conducted in the press of the western countries.

A comparatively small group, interested in a new war for economic or social considerations, would like to get millions of people, and Europeans in particular, to accept the idea that a military catastrophe is inevitable.

But is war an unavoidable fatality? Are there no ways of preventing bloodshed in Europe and in other parts of the world? These questions naturally agitate people throughout the world.

At the Berlin Conference of foreign ministers of the United States, Britain, France and the U.S.S.R. the Soviet delegation advanced a proposal for safeguarding collective security in Europe.

This proposal is an alternative to the treaty for the "European Defence Community".

What is the difference between these two alternative plans proposed by the Soviet Union and by the Western Powers?

Is there any ground for the claims that the "European Defence Community" would tend to unite Europe and avert war?

How is the question of European security treated in the Soviet proposal?

It is the purpose of this booklet to answer this and other questions relating to European security.

## CONTENTS

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Europe—United or Divided? .. .. .  | 7    |
| Division of Europe—where does it lead? .. ..   | 8    |
| Does E.D.C. safeguard Europe against a revival of<br>German militarism? .. .. .                                  | 10   |
| Relation of forces in E.D.C. .. .. .   | 12   |
| The Soviet alternative .. .. .   | 14   |
| Soviet Draft General European Treaty and the United<br>Nations Charter .. .. .                                   | 15   |
| Germany's place in the European Collective Security<br>System .. .. .  | 16   |
| Could the U.S.A. join the General European Treaty?   | 19   |
| Could any state attain supremacy in the European Collec-<br>tive Security System? .. .. .                        | 20   |
| Is a European Collective Security System possible with the<br>world divided into different social systems? .. .. | 21   |

## EUROPE—UNITED OR DIVIDED?

EVERYONE knows—though sometimes the fact tends to be forgotten—that both the First and Second World Wars began in Europe.

Furthermore, both world wars came from the same source—militarist Germany. And both of them were preceded by the division of Europe into two hostile camps.

In the First World War, it was the "Triple Alliance" against the "Entente". In the Second World War, it was the Nazi-Fascist axis against the anti-Hitler coalition.

All the experience of history confirms beyond a doubt that, if world peace is to be preserved, peace in Europe must be strengthened by every possible means, and everything possible must be done to prevent the division of Europe into hostile camps.

Does this danger exist today?

Yes, it does. This danger is latent in the so-called European Defence Community, which, as is known, embraces six states: France, Western Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg.

Altogether, there are thirty-two countries in Europe. It follows that E.D.C. "unites" less than one in five of the European states. It would perhaps be more accurate to say that it *divides* artificially a comparatively small portion of the European continent from the rest of Europe.

What is the territory occupied by the six states which have signed the E.D.C. agreement? Only slightly more than 380,000 square miles—about *one-tenth* of the total area of Europe.

Let us compare the population in E.D.C. countries and that in the rest of Europe. Some 150 million of Europe's total population of about 560 million live in these six countries. And those 150 million, in their majority, are actively opposed to E.D.C., not

to mention those who simply look upon the idea with disfavour. Recent events in France testify to the truth of this.

And so, it is the purpose of E.D.C. to segregate *one-tenth* of Europe's territory, *one-fifth* of the European countries and about *one-quarter* of Europe's inhabitants, embracing many millions of people opposed to E.D.C.

If this is called the "unification of Europe", then what is the meaning of the division or splitting of Europe?

### DIVISION OF EUROPE—WHERE DOES IT LEAD?

**T**HE European Defence Community not only separates one part of Europe from the other, but also antagonises one part against the other.

The purpose of E.D.C.—and its sponsors make no secret of this—is to form a "united army" of six West European states, or, in other words, to create a military bloc of states spear-headed against other European states.

True, the supporters of E.D.C. assure us that this military bloc is created not for war, but for "defence". It is well known, however, that no military bloc in history has ever openly avowed that its purpose was to unleash war.

The Austro-German group was the first of such blocs to be formed before the First World War. That later turned into the "Triple Alliance" of Germany, Austro-Hungary and Italy, whose founders proclaimed in a treaty of alliance of May 20, 1882, that their "desire to strengthen the guarantees of general peace" had led them to conclude "a protective, defence treaty".

In retaliation opposing groups appeared. First, the Franco-Russian Alliance, and later the "Entente", uniting Russia, France and Britain.

The First World War was, essentially, one between these opposing groups. And history has shown that in reality the treaty of the "Triple Alliance" was used for unleashing the First World War.

The notorious "Berlin-Rome axis" reached its culmination on the eve of the Second World War in the formation of the military bloc of Germany, Japan and Italy known as the "Anti-Comintern pact".

The sponsors of that pact also professed as their aim "to take defence measures" and "to elaborate jointly measures for protection" against . . . "the communist menace".\*

However, its real purpose was not "defence measures" or "measures for protection" against some mythical "communist menace", but the preparation of the Second World War.

Convincing proof of this is the fact that the first victims of that pact were some western, and by no means communist, powers.

History shows that the formation of antagonistic military groups in Europe must inevitably aggravate relations between states, must spread hostility and distrust among them, to say nothing of the fact that it is attended by an arms drive with all the consequences emanating from this for the peoples.

The formation of military groups of countries inevitably impels other countries to take the necessary measures for safeguarding their security.

Both the First and Second World Wars were started by the German militarists. And the question has now again arisen of creating a military bloc in partnership with the German militarists.

The "European army", projected under the Paris agreement, is to include as its main shock force divisions composed of men of the former Wehrmacht. But like their predecessors, the West German militarists are thinking of revenge, of war, and not of "defence" against a non-existent menace.

The participation of these revenge-seeking forces in E.D.C. merely accentuates its *aggressiveness*.

True, the initiators of E.D.C. assure us that it is practically the purpose of the Paris agreement to "curb" the German militarists and to provide guarantees against a revival of German militarism. Let us see what these promises are worth.

---

\* Article II of the "Anti-Comintern pact" of November 15, 1936, and point (a) of the "Signature Protocol".



## DOES E.D.C. SAFEGUARD EUROPE AGAINST A REVIVAL OF GERMAN MILITARISM?

**I**t is the purpose of the European Defence Community to form a "united army" of six West European states. But five of these states have their national armies, whereas the sixth—Western Germany—has no army of its own officially.

The formation of a "united army" would mean, consequently, that those five states would no longer possess any national armed forces. As for Western Germany, the Paris agreement invests her with a right she did not possess before—namely, the right to form military forces.

Article 9 of this agreement provides plainly for the formation of German units for the "European army", which means that it legalises the formation of West German armed forces.

A special military protocol lays it down concretely that these units will be composed of "homogeneous national" (i.e., purely German) divisions headed by commanders of the same nationality.

The "inter-national principle" is proposed only for the organisation of the corps. But even in this case, the reservation is made that "whenever that is dictated by tactical or organisational needs", the corps will have homogeneous national composition.

It follows that the appearance of West German divisions and corps under the command of former Hitler generals will be a direct result of E.D.C.

The second result of E.D.C. will be full-capacity war production in Western Germany. That, too, is provided for in the Paris agreement. In particular, Western Germany will be given permission to conduct military research, i.e., to produce new types of armaments, atomic and rocket weapons included.

And so, the essence of the agreement for E.D.C. lies in that

it legalises the restoration of the war machine in Western Germany.

The supporters of E.D.C. assure us that they will succeed in limiting the West German armed forces to twelve divisions.

Can that be relied upon?

Even today, only nine years after the defeat of Hitler Germany, the West German militarists have quite strong reserves in their hands. There are various military and semi-military formations with a strength of about 368,000.

The crop of soldiers' unions has grown to 528 at the beginning of 1954. According to some sources, their membership exceeds one million.

Commanders for the new army are also being prepared. The general staff has in fact been restored, and it is headed by Heusinger, Speidel and other fascist generals.

It already has in its service about 180 officers, including 125 with Hitler military decorations on their breasts. All preparations have been made for introducing military conscription.

The Bonn revenge-seekers speak no longer of 12, but of 25 and even 60 West German divisions. It will not be amiss to recall that whereas Weimar Germany had 10 divisions, after Hitler had decreed military conscription their number had grown to 36 in 1935, to 98 in 1939 and to 205 in 1941.

Is it possible to forget the tragedy resulting from that?

None other than John Wheeler-Bennett, British Foreign Office adviser on problems of history, observes in his latest book\* that within a shorter period of time than after the First World War, Germany is again rearming with the open and energetic assistance of the western powers.

It is not difficult to understand that the speed of remilitarisation in Western Germany will be greatly quickened *after the official inauguration of the Wehrmacht under the "European" signboard*. The threat of German aggression will then become even more real.

The very fact that the so-called British and American "guarantees" to the partners of E.D.C. were published in the spring of this year was an indirect recognition of the danger of a recurrence of German aggression as a result of the formation of the European army.

But the "guarantees", as even many of the European army supporters admit, in no way prevent this danger.

\* "The Nemesis of Power—the German Army in Politics, 1918-1945."

## RELATION OF FORCES IN E.D.C.

**T**HE composition of the European Defence Community is such that different partners will inevitably carry different weight in this bloc.

With respect to economic potential Western Germany is at the top of the list. She is superior in this respect not only to each E.D.C. partner but to all the E.D.C. countries taken together.

Western Germany supplies more coal than all the other five countries, and as for steel, even today, when her production capacities are not fully utilised, she supplies about 40 per cent of the steel produced by the E.D.C. countries.

Brought up to full-capacity production, the iron and steel industry of Western Germany will turn out much more than the steel mills of all the E.D.C. countries. The same picture may be observed in such key branches of production as the chemical, electrical equipment, machinery and optical industries.

Who owns these vast economic resources? West German steel is in the hands of Krupp, Thyssen, Flick and Mannesmann; West German coal—in the hands of Stinnes, Kloeckner, and Fegler; the West German chemical industry—in the hands of Merton, Schmitz, Schnitzler, Schroeder, etc., etc.

These names are well known. They are responsible for the blood and lives given by millions of Europeans in the two world wars of our century.

But apart from her economic superiority, Western Germany has a potential for overwhelming military superiority over the other E.D.C. countries.

In 1940, it took the German militarists only six weeks to capture four out of five countries now included in E.D.C.—France, Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg.

In fact, they destroyed Luxembourg altogether as an indepen-

dent state; they severed Alsace and Lorraine from France and proclaimed them component parts of "Greater Germany". They trampled upon the independence and sovereignty of all the occupied countries and instituted their "new order" in Western Europe.

And that was done by the same Krupps, Flicks and Halders who are now making the political weather in the west of Germany.

To these people E.D.C. can have only one purpose, their own domination, and the creation of E.D.C. and European army—a means for achieving this purpose in the form most convenient and suitable in the present situation.

During the campaign for election to the West German Parliament in 1953, Chancellor Adenauer, having in mind the creation of E.D.C., said:

"This Europe will be. And then we shall provide to our youth what it needs: greater space for political, economic and cultural expansion. Without this space, our youth will not see better days."

At a later date, "concretising" Adenauer's statement, the Bonn Minister Seehofer said that Germany should be "given back" the former "imperial regions."

That was the term used by the Hitlerites during the occupation period with reference to the Polish territories ("Wartegau"), the Sudeten region of Czechoslovakia and the French territories of Alsace and Lorraine.

One of the leaders of the "German Party" in West Berlin, a certain Heinits, says without beating about the bush that the "leading role" in Europe belongs to Germany.

Speaking of E.D.C., he said that "Germany must assume leadership in this Community".

West Germany's economic and military superiority over the other partners of E.D.C. in combination with the open revenge-seeking course of the present-day West German rulers, confronts the other five countries with the dangerous prospect of finding themselves in the position of Bonn satellites in the future E.D.C.

"Attempts are being made", declared the chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, G. M. Malenkov, "to assure us that, with the formation of a 'little Europe', Germany would assume her place in Europe and would be pacified. This sounds like sheer hypocrisy. Is it not clear that, as a

result of the formation of the 'European Defence Community', German militarism would seize in the west what it was unable to achieve by war? The Soviet Union is resolutely against the creation of a big aggressive Germany under the guise of a 'little Europe'."

## THE SOVIET ALTERNATIVE

AT the Berlin Conference, the Soviet delegation submitted for the consideration of the four foreign ministers its proposal for safeguarding security in Europe and a draft General European Treaty on Collective Security in Europe.

The main purpose of these two proposals is to secure the concerted efforts of all the European states for safeguarding security in Europe and to prevent the formation of antagonistic military groups of European states.

Unlike the E.D.C. agreement, the General European Treaty on Collective Security in Europe provides for the participation of all European states, irrespective of their location (in the north or south, west or east) or their social systems.

To become a party to this treaty it is enough to recognise its purposes and to assume the obligations arising from it. Unlike the Paris agreement, the Soviet draft collective security treaty leaves no room for any encroachments upon the sovereignty of the signatories.

All the countries preserve their national armed forces. At the same time they undertake obligations which exclude the use of these armed forces for aggressive purposes.

The parties to the treaty undertake to refrain from any attack on one another and from threats or use of force in international relations.

The treaty provides that an armed attack in Europe on one or more of the parties to the treaty by any state or group of states shall be considered an attack on all the parties.

The treaty provides for concrete measures to render it effective.

Should any threat of an armed attack arise in Europe, in the view of any of the parties to the treaty, the treaty signatories shall consult among themselves with the object of adopting effective measures for removing this threat and safeguarding security in Europe.

And in case of an attack on one or more parties to the treaty, every signatory of the treaty shall assist the victim with all the means at its disposal, including the use of armed force.

Thus, the plan for dividing Europe into military blocs, which lies at the basis of the E.D.C. agreement, is countered by the Soviet Union with a plan for a real unification of European countries for safeguarding peace in Europe and creating a *collective* security system for all European states.

The underlying idea of this plan is that all the European people are unanimously interested in safeguarding peace in Europe. Precisely this unity of interests affords the possibility for combined efforts to achieve this aim.

## SOVIET DRAFT GENERAL EUROPEAN TREATY AND THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

IN its preamble, the Soviet Draft General European Treaty on Collective Security in Europe declares, in full conformity with the United Nations Charter, that it is the purpose of the treaty to "safeguard peace and security and prevent aggression against any state in Europe," and to "strengthen international co-operation, in conformity with the principles of respect for the independence and sovereignty of states and of non-interference in their internal affairs."

Like the United Nations Charter, the General European Treaty proclaims the principle of peaceful settlement of disputes between states.

The conclusion of a General European Treaty would amount

to confirmation by the United Nations member-states who were signatories to this treaty, of their obligations imposed by this principle of the United Nations Charter. It would at the same time have special significance inasmuch as more than half of the European states are at present not members of the United Nations Organisation for various reasons.

But perhaps the United Nations Charter prohibits any other form of union between peace-loving states, except U.N.O.? Nothing of the kind! Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter contains a special provision concerning the right of states to conclude regional agreements. It states:

"1. Nothing in the present Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations."

It will be remembered that on September 2, 1947, an inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Aid was concluded at Rio de Janeiro between the United States and all Latin American countries.

That treaty was concluded when the United Nations was already in existence. No one considered the inter-American treaty impermissible or superfluous. Then why should an inter-American treaty exist and a general European treaty for collective security in Europe not? Obviously it has an equal right to exist.

### GERMANY'S PLACE IN THE EUROPEAN COLLECTIVE SECURITY SYSTEM

**T**HE Soviet proposal takes into consideration the real situation obtaining in Europe today when a united German state has not yet been established and two different states exist on the territory of Germany.

Germany's partition creates a dangerous situation in Europe which is pregnant with international complications and conflicts. The existence of two Germanies is relished by those who are interested in unleashing war in Europe.

The General European Treaty provides that while Germany remains divided, while a peace treaty has not yet been concluded with a unified German state, the general European system of collective security would be open to the German Democratic Republic and to the German Federal Republic, to be joined later by a unified German state.

Germany's neighbours in Europe, as well as the Germans themselves, no matter on which side of the Elbe they live, are interested in the settlement of this problem.

They understand that involving any part of Germany in a military group would mean perpetuating the partition of Germany and creating the danger of civil war.

And German history knows examples of frightful consequences of such civil wars for the German people. It is enough to recall that only four million out of 17 million survived in the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648).

The Soviet proposals contain a number of provisions the realisation of which would create favourable conditions for settling the German problem in the interests of peace in Europe and in favour of the national interests of the German people.

Most important in this sense is Article 2 of the Soviet proposals.

All the occupation forces, with the exception of limited contingents, are to be withdrawn from the territories of Eastern and Western Germany simultaneously, within a period of six months.

In the case of the security of either part of Germany being threatened, the powers now performing occupation functions in Germany shall have the right to bring in their troops: the U.S.S.R. into Eastern Germany, and the United States, Britain and France into Western Germany.

For the maintenance of internal order and the protection of their frontiers the German Democratic Republic and the German Federal Republic will have police units, the strength and armaments of which will be determined by agreement among the four powers.

Article 3 of the Soviet proposals specifies that the four powers

will take urgent measures to facilitate the conclusion of a treaty of collective security among the European states, which is to provide appropriate guarantees against aggression and breaches of the peace in Europe.

As can be seen from these Articles, the Soviet proposals are designed to prevent the revival of German militarism and German aggression today, before the unification of Germany, and in the future, when Germany again becomes one state.

When the danger of a revival of German militarism disappears, then the differences between the Soviet Union and the western powers over the German question will be eradicated.

If the involving of one part of Germany or another in any antagonistic military blocs is prevented, that will automatically remove the most serious obstacles to the establishment of a united, democratic, peaceloving German state.

Internal and international pre-conditions will thus be created for a peaceful and democratic settlement of the German problem.

Article 1 of the Soviet proposals for safeguarding security in Europe emphasises that the four powers should "continue their efforts to reach an adequate settlement of the German problem".

It is known that at the Berlin Conference the Soviet Union submitted a constructive programme for a peaceful settlement of the German problem.

It laid before the conference proposals for a draft peace treaty with Germany, for the preparation of a peace treaty with Germany and for the convocation of a peace conference on the German peace treaty, for the formation of a provisional all-German government and for holding free all-German elections.

These and other proposals of the U.S.S.R. on the German question presented in Berlin are in the interests of peace and security in Europe and accord with the national aspirations of the German people. But these proposals were rejected by the western powers.

## COULD THE U.S.A. JOIN THE GENERAL EUROPEAN TREATY?

SOME critics of the Soviet proposals maintain that these proposals are intended to "divide" the western world, to "isolate" the United States from Western Europe, etc.

These arguments are very far from the truth.

What the U.S.S.R. proposed in Berlin was that the parties to the General European Treaty should invite the governments of the United States and the People's Republic of China to delegate their representatives as observers to the organs to be instituted under this treaty.

But this proposal brought forth criticism from the representatives of the western powers at the Berlin conference, and from some western political leaders after the Berlin Conference.

Right at the Berlin Conference the Soviet delegation stated that that particular point of the Soviet proposal could be formulated differently. And in its Note of March 31 last, to the governments of France, Great Britain and the United States, the Soviet government indicated that it saw no obstacles to a favourable decision of the question of United States participation in the General European Treaty.

In making this statement, the Soviet government took into account the United States' participation in the Second World War in the common struggle against Hitler aggression and the responsibility borne by the United States together with the U.S.S.R., France and Britain for a post-war settlement in Europe.

Addressing the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. on April 26, 1954, the head of the Soviet government, G. M. Malenkov, declared:

"We have no intention of isolating the United States of America from Europe. We see no obstacle preventing the government of the United States from signing the General European Treaty on Collective Security in Europe."

## **COULD ANY STATE ATTAIN SUPREMACY IN THE EUROPEAN COLLECTIVE SECURITY SYSTEM?**

SOME of the opponents of the Soviet plan speak of the danger of the U.S.S.R. acquiring supremacy in a general European system for collective security in Europe due to the fact that the Soviet Union is the most powerful European state.

The strength of the Soviet Union is an undeniable fact. But it is also undeniable that the General European Treaty on Collective Security in Europe is based on the principle of respect for the independence and sovereignty of all signatory countries, which means that the Soviet Union will just be an equal among equals.

"... The Soviet Union," V. M. Molotov emphasised in a speech on March 11, 1954, "does not claim any privileged position in the system of collective security of the European states."

It is proposed that, in addition to the Soviet Union, two other European great powers—Great Britain and France—should take part in this treaty, as well as other European states, on the basis of equality.

Furthermore, as already mentioned, the U.S.S.R. sees no obstacles to a favourable decision of the question of United States participation in this treaty. All this speaks for itself.

But there is yet another circumstance that should be borne in mind. In addition to the principle of sovereignty and independence of states, the General European Treaty upholds the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of these states.

The preamble to this treaty specifies that it is concluded "in conformity with the principles of respect for the independence and sovereignty of states and of non-interference in their internal affairs."

Furthermore, the Soviet Union has declared its readiness to consider any proposals that could remove fear lest one state or another secure supremacy in the system of collective security in Europe.

At the Berlin Conference, V. M. Molotov stated:

"If apprehensions of this kind exist, we are prepared to consider proposals designed to prevent the supremacy of one European state over another. We are prepared to remove these apprehensions."

## **IS A EUROPEAN COLLECTIVE SECURITY SYSTEM POSSIBLE WITH THE WORLD DIVIDED INTO DIFFERENT SOCIAL SYSTEMS?**

THE real situation in Europe and Asia today is characterised by the fact that side by side with the capitalist states there exist the socialist Soviet Union, which is building communism, and the states which are building socialism.

The question that arises is: can states with different social systems exist peacefully side by side, and is it possible for them to act in one camp when it is a question of safeguarding peace and security of the nations?

Historical experience shows that it is both possible and necessary.

The difference between the social systems of the U.S.S.R., Britain, France and the United States did not prevent them from joining in the anti-Hitler coalition and fighting together against the fascist aggressors during the Second World War.

Difference in social system was no obstacle to the conclusion of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty of May 26, 1942, and the Franco-Soviet Treaty of December 10, 1944, or to the adoption of concerted decisions on a post-war settlement of the German problem.

If that could be accomplished in time of war, why cannot the same be practised today, in time of peace?

The fact that the peaceful co-existence of capitalism and socialism is possible was substantiated theoretically by the founder of the Soviet state, V. I. Lenin, as far back as thirty-five years ago.

In its relations with the capitalist countries, the Soviet state adheres consistently to this Leninist principle. Rejection of the policy of peaceful co-existence of countries with different social systems, attempts to unleash another world holocaust are a grave crime against mankind.

With the present level of military technique, with the existence of atomic and hydrogen weapons, another world war would imperil the existence of human civilisation.

That being the case, all mankind is especially interested in converting the *possibility* of peaceful co-existence of countries with different social and economic systems into a *reality*.

And recognition that states with capitalist and socialist social systems can exist peacefully side by side is the underlying principle of the Soviet proposals for the organisation of collective security in Europe.

In his statement on the results of the Berlin Conference published on March 5, 1954, V. M. Molotov said:

"Our objective is that, on the question of the defence of peace, there should not be two camps, either in Europe or throughout the world. We call on all European states to *renounce the establishment of military groupings* opposed to one another, since the establishment of such groupings cannot but lead to war. Instead of this we propose that a *single camp be formed of all European states* striving to safeguard their security and to strengthen peace in Europe."

## Postscript

WHAT will be the further course of developments? Only the future can tell.

It is, however, already clear that only the combined efforts of the peoples of Europe can ensure peace and security in this part of the world.

Only real unity of the European countries for safeguarding peace can prevent the periodic destruction of entire generations of Europeans in bloody wars.

And it is this unity of European countries in the interest of peace that the proposals of the U.S.S.R.—which we have analysed here point by point—are designed to secure.

On the other hand, the only result that E.D.C. can produce is the division of the European countries for the purpose of war.

These short-sighted politicians who are again indulging in the hope that they will direct the German war machine to the east, forget the repeated failures suffered by this course. They forget that German planes were raiding London and that Nazi divisions were in the streets of Paris before Hitler's attack on Russia.

And what is the situation today? Speaking in Britain's parliament, Lord Silkin said there was a possibility, if not a danger, that should Germany find it to her advantage she would be prepared to fight against Britain and not with Britain. This anxiety is quite justified!

Those who would have Europe divided in military blocs often say that they are prepared to risk a revival of German militarism owing to the "Soviet threat".

But fewer and fewer people in Europe, and not only in Europe, are inclined to believe in the existence of this "threat".

The Soviet Union has nothing in common with ideas of aggres-

sion and conquests. And the peoples can see that the purpose of the policy of the U.S.S.R. is to promote international co-operation and reduce international tension.

And are not the Soviet proposals for a collective security system in Europe indicative of that? Is not evidence of that contained, for example, in the persistent struggle of the U.S.S.R. for an agreement to outlaw the use of atomic energy for military purposes?

Lastly, this and no other aim is behind the Soviet government's declaration of its readiness to consider, together with the interested governments, the question of the participation of the U.S.S.R. in N.A.T.O.

It is quite clear that given the appropriate conditions, N.A.T.O. could lose its aggressive character if its members included all the great powers which made up the anti-Hitler coalition.

It would then no longer be a closed military group of states but would be open to other European countries; and that, together with an effective collective security system in Europe, would play a most important part in strengthening general peace.

However, these and other proposals contained in the Soviet government's Note of March 31 were rejected by the governments of the three western powers.

This move showed that they are not interested in a relaxation of international tension.

Mankind desires peace. And as before, the issue of peace and war is decided to a large degree on the European continent. Security in other parts of the world depends largely on security in Europe.

A collective security system in Europe would guarantee peace in Europe and would contribute immensely towards the maintenance of peace throughout the world.