

★ 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 3/3 for 3 months; 6/6 for 6 months; 13/- 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)

MEETING OF THE

**SUPREME  
SOVIET**

of the  
**USSR**



February 8th and 9th, 1955

Speeches by  
**N. A. BULGANIN**  
**V. M. MOLOTOV**  
and Declaration

SOVIET  
NEWS  
BOOKLET

1 P

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>



★ 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  
U.S.S.R.

**Soviet  
Weekly**

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 3/3 for 3 months; 6/6 for 6 months; 13/- 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)

MEETING OF THE

**SUPREME  
SOVIET** of the  
**USSR**



February 8th and 9th, 1955

Speeches by  
N. A. BULGANIN  
V. M. MOLOTOV  
and Declaration

SOVIET  
NEWS  
BOOKS

MEETING OF THE  
SUPREME SOVIET  
OF THE  
USSR

February 8 and 9, 1955

---

	<i>Page</i>
Declaration .. .. .	5
Speech by N. A. Bulganin .. .. .	8
Report by V. M. Molotov .. .. .	18
Resolution .. .. .	53

OUR COVER PICTURE SHOWS a view of the Kremlin from the Bolshoi Kamenny Bridge. The large white building is the one in which the Supreme Soviet meets.

"Soviet News"

February 1955. No. 5

# Declaration

*The Following is the text of the Declaration approved by the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. at its meeting on February 9:*

**T**HE supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers it its duty to draw the attention of the peoples and parliaments of all countries to the situation which is developing in Europe and Asia and in other parts of the world and which is greatly increasing international tension and the threat to the security of the nations.

Military groupings of certain states are being set up in Europe, directed against other European states. The dangerous policy is being pursued of reviving German militarism, which not so long ago unleashed a world war that brought innumerable disasters to the peoples.

The danger is arising that Europe might become the scene of another war. Such a war would inevitably turn into a new world war.

Nor can the situation in Asia and the Far East fail to arouse concern for the fate of peace. Here too, it is the duty of all the peoples to prevent war, to safeguard the national rights of the Asian peoples, their independence and sovereignty.

The arms drive and the establishment of military bases on foreign territories, which accompany the policy of building up military blocs, are continuing, increasing the tension in relations between countries.

Atomic war is being prepared in secret, behind the backs of the peoples. This is being done regardless of the fact that a devastating atomic war would cause vast destruction and take an incalculable toll of human lives, especially in the countries which have the highest concentration of population and industry on small territories.

Notwithstanding the fact that the United Nations has recognised that war propaganda is impermissible, and has condemned it, open and brazen calls for another war and for the use of

atomic weapons are being made in certain countries, without meeting with any rebuff.

All this demands that the countries striving to maintain and strengthen peace should greatly increase their efforts designed to achieve such high aims as the establishment of a system of collective security in Europe and to end foreign interference in the domestic affairs of other nations, which is of particular importance at the present time for the maintenance of peace in the Far East.

The Soviet Union considers that the arms drive must be ended. The question of a universal reduction of armaments—and, first and foremost, a substantial reduction of the armaments of the big states—must be settled without delay. Atomic and all other weapons of mass destruction must be banned. The carrying out of the appropriate measures should be ensured by effective international control.

The Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers it of exceedingly great importance that relations among countries, large and small, should be based on those international principles which would facilitate the development of friendly co-operation among the nations, in conditions of a peaceful and tranquil life.

Relations among countries must be based on the principles of equality, non-interference in domestic affairs, non-aggression and renunciation of encroachments on the territorial integrity of other states, and on respect for sovereignty and national independence.

The observance of these principles, which already underlie the relations of such states as the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, India and a number of other countries, ensures the peaceful co-existence of states, irrespective of their social and state systems.

The peoples are vitally concerned to strengthen world peace. They are fully able to prevent another war, for the forces of peace are steadily growing and already at the present time are more powerful than the forces of aggression and war.

The Soviet Union, relying on the indestructible unity of its peoples, on its inexhaustible resources, is fully resolved to safeguard the peaceful labour of its citizens and to protect them from all encroachments from without. Other peoples, as in the past, will find in the Soviet state a firm, indestructible bulwark in the struggle for peace and progress.

The Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics recognises that parliaments bear a great responsibility for the preservation and consolidation of peace. It is they that take legislative decisions on questions of war and peace.

The Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers that the establishment of direct contact between parliaments, the exchange of parliamentary delegations, and addresses by parliamentary delegations of one country in the parliament of another, would be in accordance with the peoples' desire to develop friendly relations and co-operation.

The Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would sincerely welcome any steps by the parliaments of other states designed to strengthen peace among the nations.

Kremlin, Moscow. February 9, 1955.

**Speech by**  
**N. A. BULGANIN**  
**at the session of the USSR**  
**Supreme Soviet on February 9**  
**1955**

*We publish below the full text of the speech made by N. A. Bulganin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. and Deputy of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet, at the meeting of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. on February 9.*

**C**OMRADES Deputies, you have done me a great honour and shown great confidence in me by appointing me Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. I thank you, Comrades, for the honour and I assure you that I shall make every effort to justify your confidence (*applause*).

Allow me to speak on the main questions of the forthcoming work of the Council of Ministers.

First of all I must assure the Supreme Soviet that in all its activities the Council of Ministers will continue unswervingly to pursue the policy drawn up by the Communist Party (*applause*) and warmly approved by our people—the policy of building a communist society, of further increasing the might of the Soviet state and strengthening the alliance between the working class and the collective farm peasantry, the policy of consolidating peace and security (*applause*).

The carrying out of such a policy ensures further prosperity for our socialist state and increased wellbeing for the people. And it is to the high aim of improving the life of the working people in every way that all the activities of the Communist Party and the Soviet government are subordinated.

Heavy industry has always been, and remains, the foundation for the further advance of our national economy. Today the output of heavy industry is nearly three and a half times as great as in the prewar year 1940.

Our highly developed heavy industry represents a historic achievement of the Communist Party and the Soviet people. It is well known that heavy industry has rendered splendid service in building socialism and consolidating our country's independence. Heavy industry is the foundation of the invincible defensive capacity of our country and the might of our brave armed forces. Remember, Comrades, the hard years of the Great Patriotic War. If at that time our country had not possessed a powerful economic foundation—our heavy industry—we should not have achieved victory over an enemy who was armed to the teeth. Heavy industry has ensured the freedom and independence of our country.

Heavy industry ensures the development of all branches of our national economy—agriculture, and the light and the food industries—and is therefore the source of the continued rise in the wellbeing of the Soviet people.

In order to ensure the advance of agriculture, which provides raw materials for light industry, it must be supplied with tractors, combines and other farm machinery in sufficient quantities. Only heavy industry is able to give us all this.

In developing heavy industry we have always followed, and we shall continue to follow the directives of great Lenin and J. V. Stalin, the loyal continuer of his work. The line of giving the predominant place to the development of heavy industry, which our Party upheld in fierce battle against the class enemy and his agents, has been justified by the entire course of socialist construction in our country. It is in accord with the vital interests of the Soviet state and our people.

In the economic sphere, therefore, the government will continue firmly to apply the general line of the Communist Party, which provides for the development of heavy industry in every way (*prolonged applause*).

A very important task of the government is to carry out the measures drawn up by the Communist Party for the development of socialist agriculture and designed to ensure the satisfaction of the constantly rising requirements of the population as regards foodstuffs and of industry as regards raw materials.

Of great importance in this connection is the decision of the

recent plenary meeting of the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which set the task, within the next five to six years, of bringing the annual grain harvest up to not less than 10,000 million poods\* and more than doubling the output of the main livestock products.

The plenary meeting of the Party's central committee has pointed out the ways and means for accomplishing this task—a task of the entire people. Among these means, together with the raising of yields and cutting of losses during the harvest, the development of virgin and long-unused land is the most accessible and rapid. Already in 1956 the sown area of these lands will amount to not less than 28-30 million hectares†. The expansion of the maize area from three and a half million to 28 million hectares‡ is also a major reserve for the production of grain. An increase in the production of grain, and especially of such a high yielding crop as maize, will make it possible to achieve a radical solution of the problem of establishing fodder resources for livestock farming.

The accomplishment within five to six years of such magnificent tasks in agriculture is entirely feasible and within our country's power. But this demands the mobilisation of the efforts of the collective farm peasantry, the working class and the whole Soviet people in order to raise the efficiency of agriculture production to a new and higher level, on the basis of the latest techniques and the advanced, highly productive methods of work which our foremost agriculturists have mastered to perfection.

Reports from all parts of the country show that the working people of town and countryside wholeheartedly approve the decisions of the plenary meeting of the central committee and are ready to carry them out. Party and government bodies must direct the effort to accomplish the task set by the plenary meeting of the central committee—a task which is of importance to the whole country—and, for their part, must do everything necessary to achieve this goal.

On the basis of the further development of heavy industry and the advance of agriculture, there will be an increase in the output of consumer goods—clothing, footwear, foodstuffs, household goods and articles meeting the cultural requirements of the population.

We must pay special attention to the further development of Soviet science, bringing science still closer to the solution of urgent problems of communist construction and raising to a still

\* More than 160 million long tons.

† About 70-75 million acres.

‡ From 8,600,000 to 69 million acres approx.

higher level the part it plays in promoting technical progress and the advance of socialist culture.

All the tasks in the sphere of the national economy which I have just enumerated, and also such important tasks as the further development of rail, water and other forms of transport, the expansion of housing construction, the utmost development of trade, as well as the improvement of the health services and the development of education, will find concrete expression in the Sixth Five-Year Plan which will have to be drawn up this year.

Comrades Deputies, our immediate task in guiding the national economy is to fulfil the state plan for this year, the last year of the Fifth Five-Year Plan.

The state plan for the development of the national economy for 1955 envisages an increase of more than nine per cent. in the gross output of industry as compared with last year. The output of industry this year will be 80 per cent. higher than in 1950. This means that we shall complete the Fifth Five-Year Plan in industry ahead of schedule.

The output of heavy industry will increase to a still greater extent. It will go up by 84 per cent. during the five-year period. The carriage of goods by rail and motor transport and cargo carriage by inland water transport and the merchant navy will increase as compared with last year.

In agriculture important work must be carried out already this year in fulfilment of the decision of the January plenary meeting of the central committee of the Party. The plan provides for a substantial increase in the production of grain, industrial crops, potatoes, vegetables, meat, milk, eggs and wool.

The increase of agricultural raw material resources envisaged in the 1955 plan will ensure further expansion of the output of consumer goods, which will increase by 71 per cent. compared with 1950.

This year will see a further rise in the material wellbeing and cultural level of the people. The national income will be 10 per cent. higher than last year. The wage bill for factory and office workers will go up, as will the money incomes of the peasants in cash and in kind; housing construction will be expanded.

Fulfilment of this year's plan for the development of the national economy will require maximum mobilisation and better utilisation of the existing potentialities of economic organisations and strenuous work on the part of our whole people.

Of very great importance for the achievement of the aims set by the plan is a continued increase in labour productivity. Higher labour productivity is a major factor for increased output by the national economy, lower production costs and greater accumulation. However, it must be admitted in all honesty that

we have serious shortcomings in this important matter. The increase in labour productivity lags behind the Five-Year Plan target.

Comrades, we must not forget Lenin's teaching that productivity of labour is of decisive importance in building the new society. It should be borne in mind that we can increase supplies for the people only to the extent that the productivity of all social labour is increased.

Much has been done in our country for the technical equipping and lightening of labour, and for raising the skill of the working people. This work must be continued. The organisation of labour in industry has to be improved in order to ensure that the target for increasing labour productivity fixed for 1955 is reached and surpassed, bearing in mind that this target is the minimum.

The carrying out of the economic tasks confronting us depends to a large extent on the introduction of advanced techniques on a wide scale in all branches of the national economy. Our achievements in the sphere of technique are incontrovertible. With the putting into operation of the first power station operating on atomic energy—a station designed and built by the efforts of Soviet scientists and engineers—our country took an important step in the utilisation of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. As has already been reported, work is being carried out in our country to set up substantially larger power stations, operating on atomic energy.

Yet however great our achievements are in the sphere of technical progress, there are still serious shortcomings in this respect in a number of branches of the national economy. Many scientific research and designing organisations are behind in working out highly efficient machines and methods of production corresponding to the present level of world engineering, and enterprises are behind in mastering the production of new machines and methods and introducing them in the national economy on a wide scale. This situation has to be remedied. The work of the Ministries and scientific institutions, and of the engineers and technical workers must be improved in this connection, so that technical progress in our country is speeded up year by year. Ministers and heads of departments bear the same responsibility for carrying out this requirement as for carrying out an important state task.

An important prerequisite for successful economic development are the material reserves of the state. Reserves are our strength; they reinforce the country's defensive capacity. It would therefore be an unforgivable mistake to slacken the attention paid to this highly important matter or to yield to the temptation to carry out particular or current tasks at the expense

of the state reserves. It is our major task to increase the state reserves of raw materials, semi-manufactures, fuel, manufactures and foodstuffs.

The Party has consistently pursued the policy of the all-round economic and cultural development of all the republics and districts making up the great Soviet Union. Recently several all-union Ministries have been made union-republican Ministries, and in this connection a considerable number of enterprises have been transferred from all-union to union-republican jurisdiction. By utilising the new and wider possibilities, government and economic bodies of the union republics should improve the way in which they direct economic and cultural developments.

Fulfilment of the State Budget for 1955, which has been approved by the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., requires of all Ministries, enterprises, construction jobs and economic organisations the strictest economy, daily attention to lowering production costs and the ensuring of the fixed accumulations.

We must further perfect the state apparatus and reduce the costs of maintaining it, improving its work by rooting out arm-chair bureaucrats' methods of guidance, raising the level of organisational work and responsibility for the tasks set in all links of the administration. A decisive prerequisite for the further improvement of the work of the apparatus is the instilling in all executives, senior and junior, of an appreciation of what is new, advanced and progressive; the extensive utilisation of the initiative of the working masses and the utmost development of criticism and self-criticism.

There are still many shortcomings in all fields of our state activities and economic and cultural construction, and their elimination will require the exertion of considerable efforts on our part. The Deputies who have spoken here in the discussion on the State Budget made a number of correct critical remarks regarding the work of Ministries and departments. The government will study the Deputies' speeches and take the measures necessary for eliminating the shortcomings they have mentioned.

Comrades Deputies, yesterday Comrade Molotov, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., made a report to our session. His report contains a correct analysis of the present international situation and outlines with exhaustive clarity the foreign policy of the Soviet government.

The unanimous approval of the government's foreign policy by the Deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. once again proves that this policy expresses the fundamental interests of our people. At the same time this policy is in accord with the desires and aspirations not only of our own people but also of the peoples of other countries.

The peoples have no desire that is stronger than the desire for peace.

By all its activities the Soviet government has proved, and is proving, that it stands for peace and upholds the cause of peace, that it is contributing time and time again to the easing of international tension and the consolidation of normal relations with all peoples.

In building our relations with other states we are guided by the desire to strengthen peace, observing the principle of non-interference in the affairs of other states. We stand for such negotiations, and strive for such agreements with other countries as will relieve international tension. It goes without saying that any negotiations can be successful provided that the other party will likewise strive for success. We consider that in present-day conditions this is the only practicable path which could yield constructive results.

The Soviet government will continue to pursue consistently the policy of strengthening peace and general security, the policy of friendly relations with all peoples, which has justified itself and has been tested in practice.

Equal and advantageous trade relations among the states concerned would promote a return to normal in the international situation and an improvement in the relations among countries. Every country should be able freely to sell the goods it has, and to buy everything it needs from other countries, without any discrimination whatsoever.

As for our country, we stand for extensive trade with all countries, irrespective of their state and social systems. It is clear to everyone that without trade that would take into account mutual interests, there can be no normal relations between countries. The expansion of international trade relations and the removal of obstacles to businesslike economic co-operation could greatly facilitate an improvement in the relations among states.

We believe that there are sound forces in the capitalist countries which will find the means for improving relations between countries in the interests of maintaining peace and the security of the nations.

The Soviet Union is a peaceful country. It does not threaten anyone and does not intend to attack anyone. We desire to develop political, economic and cultural relations with all countries which want to have like relations with the Soviet Union.

Close co-operation between the U.S.S.R., the United States and Britain existed during the war against fascist Germany—co-operation in which France subsequently joined. This co-operation, as we know, yielded positive results. It could have

been continued now as well, in peace-time. It is not our fault that the situation has changed. At the present time the United States government is trying to build its relations with us, not on the basis of mutual understanding, but on the basis of the "positions of strength" policy. Such a policy is dangerous, it leads, not to co-operation, but to the worsening of relations, not to a reduction of armaments, but to an arms drive, and it is fraught with the danger of precipitating another war.

We cannot underestimate the aggressive policy of the United States and its preparations for unleashing another war.

Reactionary elements in the United States and the countries dependent on it are seeking to revive German militarism and to integrate a remilitarised Western Germany in the aggressive military groupings of the western powers. In Asia, too, they are whipping together military blocs, and are organising military provocations against the People's Republic of China and interfering in its internal affairs.

The American government has embarked on the dangerous path of aggravating the situation in the Taiwan\* area. It has increased its armed forces there—its naval and air forces—and is continuing to pursue the policy of provoking war. Ignoring the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China and trampling on international agreements, the United States has seized an age-old, inalienable part of the territory of China—the island of Taiwan—and has turned it into a hotbed of military provocation in the Far East.

The attitude adopted by the United Nations in this matter is amazing. To this day it has not condemned the aggressive actions of the United States against China, and has not demanded of the United States that it immediately withdraw its armed forces from Taiwan and restore the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China. The policy of the Chinese government in this matter has won our full approval and support (*applause*). The People's Republic of China enjoys the sympathy of the Soviet people and of all progressive mankind because it is waging a struggle for a just cause, for the honour and independence of its country. In this noble cause the Chinese people can count on the help of their true friend—the great Soviet people (*prolonged applause*).

The United States of America keeps on extending its network of military bases around the peaceloving countries and intensifying its arms drive. Moreover, special stress is laid on the development of the air forces and atomic weapons.

An atmosphere of war hysteria has prevailed in the United States for a long time now. Political and military leaders con-

\* Formosa.

tinually make belligerent statements and threats, and some of them have gone so far as to call openly for the employment of atomic weapons in a war against the peaceloving states.

The madmen who are brandishing the atom bomb must be called to order. That is the demand of the peoples and no government of any country can ignore it (*applause*).

The policy of the aggressive forces of the capitalist camp will not take our peoples unawares. The aggressors, evidently, seriously believe that the more they threaten the more they will scare us. We have had occasion to hear many threats of all sorts, but the Soviet people are not of the kind that can be scared and no one will succeed in intimidating them (*prolonged applause*).

In the conditions which have developed the Soviet Union will continue to stand on guard for peace and will increase its defensive capacity. The government of the Soviet Union will strengthen its co-operation and brotherly accord with the People's Republic of China and all the people's democracies, will try to bring about the re-establishment of Germany's unity on a peaceful and democratic basis, and will expand and consolidate business relations and cultural exchanges with the countries maintaining normal relations with the Soviet Union.

What can be said of the shortsighted political leaders who regard the Soviet state's love for peace as a practical demonstration of our weakness? They should be reminded first of all of the recent lessons of history and the fate of the Hitler invaders. It is well known that there were also other adventurers who encroached on our country. All of them came to a shameful end (*applause*). Our people have always been able to stand up for themselves and deliver a crushing rebuff to those who have encroached on their freedom and independence.

It will be the same in the future, too (*prolonged applause*).

As in the past, our task is firmly and unswervingly to carry out the behest of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin—always to be vigilant and to guard the armed forces of our country and its defensive capacity as the apple of our eye (*loud applause*).

In the Great Patriotic War, the Soviet army demonstrated its superiority over the enemy's army and our armament was better than that of the German army, which at that time was regarded as having the best armaments among the armies of the capitalist states.

In order to maintain in the future, too, the superiority gained by Soviet weapons over those of the capitalist armies, the central committee of the Party and the government have done a great deal of work in the period since the war and have achieved great success in equipping our armed forces with new and completely up-to-date weapons and military material (*prolonged applause*).

We now have a first-class, well-equipped army, air force and navy of superb fighting capacity, ready to carry out any tasks set by the Communist Party and the Soviet government in order reliably to ensure our country's security (*loud applause*).

The strengthening of the defensive capacity of the state, and the maintenance of the fighting efficiency of our brave armed forces at a level dictated by the interests of our country, by the international situation and the present development of military technique will, in the future too, be one of the main concerns of our Party and government (*applause*).

Comrades Deputies, a powerful source of the strength of the Soviet state has always been the indestructible unity of the people, government and Communist Party, the moral and political unity of Soviet society, the friendship of our peoples and the readiness of the Soviet people to work heroically for the good of the socialist country.

There can be no doubt that in the future, too, the working class, the collective farm peasantry and the people's intelligentsia of our country will spare no effort to increase still further the might of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to achieve new successes in the building of communism (*loud and prolonged applause. All rise*).

## The International Situation and the Foreign Policy of the Government of the USSR

Report by

**V. M. MOLOTOV**

First Vice-chairman of the Council of Ministers and  
Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR at the  
Session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR

February 8, 1955

**C**OMRADES Deputies, ten years have passed since the end of the Second World War. The changes in the international situation, if the present state of affairs is compared to that before the war, stand out today more clearly than ever before.

Before the Second World War, the Soviet Union was the only socialist state, and was in the ring of capitalist encirclement. That was exactly how matters stood for more than a quarter of a century.

Since the war the situation, one might say, has radically changed.

Today it is no longer possible to speak of the U.S.S.R. and capitalist encirclement in the same sense that it was spoken of before the war. This would mean not to notice or, in any case, to underestimate the highly important changes which have occurred in the entire international situation. At the same time, not only quantitative but also qualitative changes have occurred.

The most important result of the First World War was, as we know, the revolutionary transformation of Russia into a Soviet

socialist state. In the period between the First and Second World Wars, our country achieved enormous successes in the development of its socialist economy, in the progress of socialist culture. Socialism triumphed in our country already before the war, but it was only after the Second World War that the U.S.S.R. had emerged from international isolation.

The most important result of the Second World War was the formation, alongside the world capitalist camp, of the world camp of socialism and democracy headed by the U.S.S.R., or more strictly speaking, headed by the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China (*stormy, prolonged applause*).

The formation of the new camp has become possible as a result of the rout of fascism, the weakening of the world positions of capitalism and the unprecedented advance of the democratic movement. It is a matter of record that our country, the Soviet people and their heroic army have played the decisive part in these international developments (*applause*).

In our times, the Soviet Union no longer finds itself in the same international situation which existed before the war. Today the U.S.S.R. is no longer the only socialist state in the world. The international isolation of the U.S.S.R. is a thing of the past.

Alongside the capitalist camp, the camp of socialism and democracy has been formed, uniting these twelve states: the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the People's Republic of China, the Polish People's Republic, the Czechoslovak Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Rumanian People's Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the People's Republic of Albania, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic and the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam.

We know that the countries I have listed stand at different levels of development, at different levels in their social transformations. Alongside the Soviet Union where the foundations of socialist society have already been built, there are also people's democracies which have made only the first, but quite important, steps towards socialism.

What is decisive, however, for all the countries of the democratic camp is that they have finally broken away from the imperialist system, where power is wielded by landlords and capitalists. They have chosen a new path for themselves and have commenced to carry out successfully their fundamental democratic and socialist transformations, seeking to ensure peace and security for all this new, great construction.

This has become possible because in these countries the workers and peasants, together with all the labouring people, and

the democratic forces have formed a strong political alliance under the general leadership of the working class. It is this revolutionary alliance of the workers and peasants, uniting all the labouring people that has made possible the abolition of landlordism and the transfer of the land to the peasants and has also secured the transfer of the factories, mills, railways and banks into the hands of the new, genuinely democratic, state power.

The shackles of capitalism have been broken not in one place but along a wide front. After our country, which had made its victorious socialist revolution in 1917, capitalism, as a result of the Second World War, suffered defeat in a number of other countries as well.

The successes of the countries of the new people's democratic type, secured by the efforts of the peoples liberated from the yoke of capital, rely both on the victory of the Soviet army over the fascist aggressors and on the unvarying support by the Soviet Union of the political, economic and social transformations which they are carrying out and which lead to socialism. At the present time, however, in addition to the significance and the special role of the U.S.S.R., whose might is based on the high level of heavy industry, and along with this on the steady advance of the whole of industry and socialist agriculture, the countries of the socialist camp also increasingly rely on mutual support.

It is perfectly natural that, in view of the changes in the world situation, the correlation of forces between the social systems has definitely changed, in favour of socialism, especially during the last decade.

Does Europe today resemble prewar Europe?

Can one ignore the immense changes which have occurred here as a result of the recent world war? And is it not clear to those who are able to reason objectively and without bias that together with the Soviet Union a number of other countries have resolutely turned from the capitalist path to the path of socialist advance and regeneration, and that not one of these countries will want to go back, to return to capitalism? And if we examine the concrete facts and figures it turns out that of the entire population of Europe, of about 600 million, roughly half, slightly less than 300 million, have firmly joined the camp of socialism and democracy.

This means that the Europe we have before us far from resembles prewar Europe.

In the new Europe of today the countries of the socialist camp hold positions no less strong than the countries of the capitalist camp. Still more important is the fact that the

countries of our socialist camp—although, with considerable difficulties and not without serious shortcomings in their work of construction—are confidently advancing, steadily strengthening the new, democratic system and raising the culture and wellbeing of their peoples to a still higher level.

A new situation has developed in Asia as well.

The population of Asia amounts to about 1,400 million, which make up more than half of the population of the globe. Today, in Asia too, slightly less than half of the population lives in the people's democracies, which have left the capitalist camp and have set themselves the goal of building socialism.

It is enough to say that China, which until recently was a semicolonial country heavily dependent on the imperialist powers and deprived of the possibility of securing the unity of its national territory, has now united into a single great state, that has taken to the path of the all-round advancement of its national culture and economy. And what is worth noting is that this has become possible only since the time when the Communist Party came to the leadership of the Chinese state (*applause*). It is not an accident that one of the now most popular songs of the Chinese people says:

“The Communists have blazed our path to victory,

Without the Communists there can be no China” (*applause*).

Do not these facts and the deep-going reforms started in Korea and in Viet Nam testify to the fundamental changes that have occurred in Asia? Does not all this show that revolutionary transformations of the greatest historical significance have taken place in Asia since the war?

But the changes in Asia are by no means limited to these countries.

Of great historical significance is the fact that colonial India no longer exists today, but there exists the Republic of India. This is an important turn in the events characteristic of postwar development in Asia. The international prestige of India, a new important factor in strengthening peace and friendship among the nations, is steadily growing.

Alongside India, Indonesia and Burma have also cast off the yoke of the colonial régime. Let us hope that Pakistan, Ceylon and the other Asian peoples will find their way to genuine national freedom and economic regeneration (*applause*).

In April, that is two months from now, a conference of Asian and African countries is to meet in Bandung, Indonesia. The attendance of some 30 Asian and African countries is contemplated. The very convocation of such a conference shows how great are the constructive changes which have occurred in Asia in the recent period.

Substantial too are the changes in the Near and Middle East. We cannot say that in the countries of the Arab East, for example, the national liberation movement has already attained the power and sweep that it has in a number of Asian states. The states existing there, especially countries possessing big oil resources, are still heavily dependent on the so-called "western" countries, which have laid their hands on local oil and other natural resources. It also happens in these places that the formation and change of governments goes ahead only at the will of American or British petroleum companies and other foreign capitalist firms. But there, too, the national liberation movement is growing steadily.

The peoples of Africa, in the majority, still live in conditions of colonial oppression. It is perfectly clear, however, that soon it will no longer be possible to strangle with impunity the national liberation movement of the African peoples, as the imperialist countries that have seized African territories are still doing.

It may be said that North and South America are still off the historic highroad upon which the peoples of Europe and Asia have successfully embarked. But the "iron curtain" by which North American imperialism would like to shut off America from the other parts of the world is by no means as strong as it seems. Vain also are the calculations based on the "iron heel" of the capitalist monopolies, of whose oppressive domination the famous American writer, Jack London, wrote so colourfully and with such bitter feeling as long as half a century ago, foreseeing with what tremendous difficulties the peoples of America will advance along the road of genuine progress and emancipation from the fetters of capitalism.

In any case, if one is to speak of the period since the Second World War, the least noticeable changes so far are those which have occurred on the American continent, although there too the progressive tendencies underneath, developing in the very depth of the people's life, are making themselves increasingly felt. Such a situation does not provide evidence of strength in the American "iron curtain," and neither does it show particular dependability in the "iron heel," with which the capitalist monopolies are pressing on the workers, and the farmers too; but it provides evidence of the fact that America will have to overcome the existing lag in its political development and that it still has to catch up with the development of political life in certain other countries.

Comparing, as a whole, the present-day international situation with that of before the war, we see what important changes have occurred in the last 10 to 15 years. It is not for us to feel sorry about these changes.

And so, of great importance in assessing the contemporary international situation as a whole is the present-day correlation of the main world forces. In doing so we must neither overestimate nor underestimate what has taken place and the trend of developments themselves. Under no circumstances must we forget that in question is a great period of history, of which only slightly more than 37 years have passed to this day.

Can it be denied that, compared with the prewar period, a serious weakening in the positions of capitalism, of the capitalist classes has occurred? No, this cannot be denied. It is also obvious that these changes have occurred in favour of socialism, in favour of the democratic and socialist forces (*applause*).

The Second World War led to a further deepening of the general crisis of the world capitalist system. This found its expression in that another, new, world camp has come into being alongside the world capitalist camp. A democratic camp has been formed which, headed by the U.S.S.R., is marching along the path of building socialism. Such are the facts, whether some people like them or not.

The economic outcome of these basic events has been the split in the single, all-embracing world market. As we know, this single world market no longer exists. There exist at present two parallel world markets, confronting one another.

In this way, each of the two political camps, that have shaped up after the Second World War, has its own corresponding economic basis. All this gives an idea of the new stage in the general crisis of capitalism, which began at the time, and as a result of the Second World War. This new stage bears witness to the serious sharpening in the general crisis of capitalism.

It would seem that the facts of the historical changes that have taken place in the international situation cannot be discounted. Actually, however, it is not always so.

Capitalism has been forced to retreat before the pressure of the masses of the people which, in a whole number of states, have overthrown the landlords and capitalists and placed in power their own people, representatives of the working class and the peasantry, the urban and rural democracy. The ruling classes of the imperialist countries, however, do not want to reconcile themselves to the new situation. This applies, primarily, to the United States of America, where the state is bossed by the millionaires and the multimillionaires. It is obvious that the capitalist magnates of Britain and other imperialist countries are not unlike those of America.

It is not hard to define their wishes.

They would like to return to the rule of capital the countries that have cast off the fetters of capitalism. This is confirmed among other things by the foreign policy pursued at present

by the imperialist countries and, specifically, such countries as the United States of America, Britain, etc.

It is not hard to see that the ruling circles of the United States, for instance, openly proclaim as the main objectives of their foreign policy nothing less than the so-called "liberation" of the countries where the workers and peasants have triumphed, where the working people themselves have come to power. They even expatiate to the effect that such—save the mark!—"liberation" would mean nothing short of their return to the "capitalist" paradise or, in their usual parlance, a return to the "free world." And such a "free world" they consider the capitalist system, where messieurs the exploiters feel themselves so free and where the ruling classes can exploit the working people freely and even "to satiety."

They would like to "liberate" the people's democracies from the state power set up by the revolutionary alliance of workers and peasants, replacing it by those to their liking—i.e., overthrow the new, socialist and democratic order of things established there after the war, and again force on them the capitalist régime so dear to their hearts, the régime of the exploitation of the working people, the régime of the rule of the capitalists and landlords.

They would like to start with the countries where, they believe, their agents can become active more rapidly. As we know, one such attempt, for instance, was made in Berlin on June 17, 1953. It is universally known, however, that it was a resounding flop. It could have served as a lesson to the aggressive imperialist circles, but propaganda for such gambles continues.

The appetites of aggressive imperialist circles and their sinister reactionary dreams are not confined to the people's democracies alone. They would like to restore our country to capitalism as well.

It is not often that they say it openly, but they do say it.

Listen, for instance, to what lengths Sir Winston Churchill, who is justly regarded as one of the most outstanding ideologists of imperialism, has gone. To this day he is repeating over and over again a thought which, as he himself puts it, has been an obsession with him "all his life," to wit the thought of "strangling Bolshevism in its cradle" (*animation in the hall*).

Here is one of his statements on the subject made on June 28, 1954, at the National Press Club in Washington: "I assure you that I have been all my life one of the really prominent people fighting this [*Communism—Ed.*]. . . . If I had been properly supported in 1919, it might have been possible to strangle communism in its cradle, but everyone pointed their hand and said, 'How shocking!'"

Even in 1954, so many years after the victory of the socialist revolution in our country, Sir Winston Churchill can think of nothing more sensible than to speak of strangling Communism "in its cradle" even though it would seem that he has been somewhat late in this (*laughter, applause*).

He is, indeed, the one for missing the bus (*laughter, applause*).

We are not averse now to making some fun of the inanity of such anti-Soviet reasoning. We cannot afford, however, to be naive: Communists, in common with all the Soviet people, must not count on the love or sympathy of the imperialists.

Churchill's speeches are shot through with longing for the past. Everything new is alien to him, and he is irreconcilably hostile to everything new that appeared with the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution and turned into a great movement of the peoples for the true liberation of the working class and all the labouring people, for the liberation from bourgeois-landlord oppression (*applause*).

For about 38 years now, Sir Winston Churchill has been calling for the overthrow of the socialist system, wherever it has appeared, yelling about the necessity of "strangling" this new system "in its cradle." He is voicing the cherished wishes of all imperialists who want but one thing: that is to say, complete world domination.

But how can this be done if the peoples themselves have already chosen another path and, making a clean break with capitalism, have taken to the path of socialism and people's democracy?

The answer to this question is the "positions of strength" policy, the foreign political line proclaimed by both American and British imperialism. In expressing the striving of the most aggressive capitalist circles, the rulers of those countries persist in refusing to accept the facts. They do not want to recognise the right of the peoples to settle their destiny for themselves, and, consequently, their right to renounce the old, to liquidate the capitalist régime and to establish their own, new socialist system.

The aggressive imperialist circles think differently. They do not want to recognise the legitimate striving of the peoples to rid themselves of the shackles of capitalism, but are out to restore the rule of capitalism throughout the world. This is the reason behind the foreign policy of, for instance, the United States of America, a policy aimed at re-establishing the rule of imperialism throughout the world, overthrowing socialism, overthrowing the rule of the working people in the people's democracies.

It is these aims that inspire the aggressive foreign policy of the United States. This policy can mean nothing else but the

preparation of a new world war, a war for the restoration of imperialism's world domination.

All this means that the new comes into being in conditions of fierce struggle against the old, that socialism cannot win in one or another country other than by hurling back and overcoming the resistance of imperialism and its agents.

Such is the postwar international situation, which determines the character of the main developments in recent years.

## II

### Two Lines in Foreign Policy

Both the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist camp, firmly and confidently upholding the positions won by the peoples, are working to strengthen these positions more and more, and to secure untroubled peaceful conditions for their socialist construction. The camp of democracy and socialism is a camp of peace. Therefore it is usually called the camp of peace, democracy and socialism.

Upholding the interests of peace and socialism, in its foreign policy of the Soviet Union stands for the easing of international tension.

Together with the Soviet Union, this foreign political line of easing international tension is upheld by all countries of the democratic camp.

The peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet Union is counterposed by the foreign political course of the United States, expressed in the "positions of strength" policy. The aggressive nature of America's foreign policy is absolutely clear.

Is it surprising then that the masses of the people take an active interest in international developments?

Millions upon millions of men and women closely follow the trend of events: whether they develop in the direction which tends to strengthen peace or, on the contrary, in the direction tending to increase the danger of another war. Nothing affects the destinies of the people and brings them so much grief and suffering as war. Is there anyone to whom it is not clear that the consequences of a new war, if mankind were to be plunged into it, would be still graver, beyond measure, than the consequences of the Second World War, which has taken a toll of many millions of lives, not to mention the immeasurable material losses sustained by the peoples?

The Soviet Union holds a special place in international developments.

The Soviet Union, the country of the triumph of socialism, holds a place of honour in the active struggle for peace, against the warmongers. In our days the Soviet Union has become the chief mainstay of peace and friendship among the nations (*loud applause*).

Together with the consolidation of the forces of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and all the people's democracies, and along with the mounting peace movement in all the other countries, the peoples are growing increasingly aware that the cause of peace lies in their own hands and that they can prevent another war and safeguard peace if they spare no effort and, when the need arises, defend the cause of peace with the utmost resolution and to the end (*prolonged applause*).

The Soviet Union sees as its main task the strengthening of the forces of peace and the promoting of an easing in international tension.

This line of Soviet foreign policy conforms most fully with the requirements of maintaining and consolidating peace. It serves at the same time to expose the aggressive plans and manoeuvres of the warmakers, of those imperialist forces that are banking on "strength," which in reality is becoming more and more a policy of preparing a third world war.

A struggle of two opposite lines of foreign policy is developing in our days.

While the peaceful line of foreign policy of the U.S.S.R. meets with ever more powerful support in the democratic camp and among democratic sections of the people in all countries, the aggressive line of United States foreign policy rests on the setting up of ever new aggressive military blocs and groupings, and finds its latest expression in open propaganda and preparation for an atomic war.

Together with this, there are countries which in the main are economically bound to the capitalist system but in international affairs show concern for the maintenance of peace and the easing of international tension. The importance of strengthening such strivings should by no means be underestimated.

What does the policy of easing international tension mean?

It can best of all be judged by the facts. We can take for example both the events of the past year and the current developments.

On the insistence of the Soviet Union, the Berlin Conference of the Foreign Ministers of France, Britain, the United States and the U.S.S.R. was held at the end of January and over the first half of February, 1954.

At that conference we strove for such decisions as would promote a considerable easing of international tension. We demanded that all four countries resolutely condemn plans which aimed at re-establishing militarism in Western Germany, and we also strove that the Berlin meeting should make progress towards convening a world conference for a general reduction of armaments. The representatives of the United States, Britain and France did not co-operate with us in this matter.

The Berlin Conference played an important constructive part, however.

The significance of the Berlin Conference consists, primarily, in that, after a five year interval, a beginning was made in the holding of new international conferences of the great powers, which is of great importance for settling urgent international issues. As for the decision, taken in Berlin, to call another conference, which was then held in Geneva, as we know, that decision yielded positive results.

It is a matter of record that together with France, Britain, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, the Geneva Conference was also attended by the People's Republic of China, and also by representatives of countries concerned in the solution of the questions of Korea and Indo-China. If the decision to call the Geneva Conference—in which, notwithstanding the resistance of the United States, the five great powers, including the People's Republic of China, took part—was a success of the Berlin Conference, then the constructive results of the Geneva Conference confirmed how necessary China's participation in that meeting was.

The Geneva Conference did not discharge its task to the end, since it made no progress in settling the Korean question. The conference reached agreement, however, on ending the war in Viet Nam, which had lasted for eight years, and also on ending hostilities in Laos and Cambodia. The agreements became possible, first and foremost, thanks to the selfless struggle of the Viet Nameese people for their freedom and national independence. This struggle, in its turn, relied on the active sympathy and support of the other peoples. All this received to a certain extent its recognition at the Geneva Conference.

Open attempts to prevent agreement on the re-establishment of peace in Indo-China were made by the United States. Not only the Secretary of State, Dulles, but also Vice-President Nixon of the United States, as die-hard protagonists of the "policy of strength," sought openly not the end of the war, and not the satisfaction of the legitimate demands of the Viet Nameese people, but continuation of the war and the armed suppression of the national liberation movement in Indo-China. They harboured

plans for "internationalising" the war against the Viet Nameese people, with a view to drawing into this war, in addition to France, the United States and Britain also; and they tried to prevent the reaching of agreement in Geneva at all costs.

Matters have gone to such lengths that Dulles, the Secretary of State of the United States, did not even wish to take part in discussing the Indo-China question, and demonstratively left Geneva. But having displayed its aggressiveness, the United States did not achieve anything, finding itself isolated.

The results of the Geneva Conference have been assessed as a defeat for the aggressive forces and, at the same time, as a major victory for the peaceloving forces. Thereby the Geneva Conference promoted an easing of international tension and the strengthening of peace.

Aggressive United States circles, however, did not wish to calm down.

As soon as the Geneva Conference was over, Dulles, Secretary of State of the United States, convened a conference of his own at Manila, in the Philippines. That conference was called with the obvious aim of preventing the carrying out of the Geneva decisions; moreover, certain participants of the Geneva Conference agreed to help in this aggressive undertaking, heedless of how this would affect their prestige.

At the Dulles-sponsored conference in Manila, a treaty for the so-called "collective defence of South-East Asia" (S.E.A.T.O.) was signed, which is a military bloc of such colonial powers as the United States, Britain and France and certain Asian countries dependent on them, such as the Philippines, Thailand and Pakistan. This treaty is filled with a desire to strangle the national liberation movement in Asia, and is obviously spearheaded against the People's Republic of China, whose international prestige rose so much during the Geneva Conference, notwithstanding the resistance offered by all sorts of reactionary circles.

What does all this show?

It shows that in the present conditions a step toward easing international tension encounters every resistance from the most aggressive circles, interested not in easing but in worsening tension. This means that the easing of international tension cannot be achieved otherwise than through a persistent struggle against the most aggressive forces and their intrigues and, consequently, the struggle must not be slackened but should be continued with still greater persistence, skill and consistency.

Events are now also taking place in the Far East which are evidence of fresh attempts by the aggressive forces to increase their efforts to prevent an easing of international tension.

What, if not this, is the lesson of the developments in the area of Taiwan and other Chinese islands?

From the history of imperialist aggression it is difficult to quote more disgraceful incidents than the developments in this area in recent years.

Indeed, the island of Taiwan and the Penghu Islands,\* not to mention the other off-shore islands of China, are indisputably the territory of China. This was particularly recognised in the Cairo declaration of 1943 and, subsequently, in the Potsdam declaration of 1945, signed by both the United States of America and Britain. Moreover, this was established in the Act of Surrender of Japan, which at the end of the 19th century seized these islands, but under the Act of Surrender returned them to China.

Notwithstanding all this, these islands have now been seized by the United States of America which, with its own money, maintains there Chiang Kai-shek's criminal gang, which was driven out of China, and is preparing with the help of his mercenary troops, an attack on China. Recently matters have gone to such lengths that the President and the Congress of the United States have been so carried away by their "policy of strength" that they have openly started to threaten war against the Chinese people, who are upholding their rights to these islands, and are defending their national honour and sovereignty against the aggressor.

The stand of the Soviet Union on this question is clear-cut and well known.

We consider the question of Taiwan to be a domestic affair of China's and regard the predatory actions of the United States and its threat of war as aggression, which must be condemned unreservedly by the United Nations, if it prizes its authority (*applause*). It is no longer possible to tolerate a situation where the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations have not yet been restored, because of opposition by the United States. The United States must withdraw from Taiwan and the Taiwan Straits all its armed forces including air and naval forces. Then the hostilities in the Far East will cease, and peace will be established (*applause*).

While the stand of the United States on the question of Taiwan leads to the endangering of peace and to a greater tension in international relations, the stand of the Soviet Union in this case is in keeping with the interests of easing international tension, and is aimed at strengthening peace in the Far East.

We, naturally, have in mind such an easing of international tension which is possible of achievement, not by undermining

\* The Pescadores.

or curtailing the freedom and the national rights of this or that country, this or that people, but by the ensuring and possibly the strengthening of these democratic rights, as the interests of progress in the life of countries and peoples demand.

Important as these events in Asia are, there is no reason to hold that the European situation can be relegated to the background.

It is enough to recall the Paris agreements to appreciate the tenseness of the situation there.

There is no need to prove that, ever since the end of the Second World War, the German question has been in the forefront of all European problems. It would seem that the ten years that have elapsed since the end of the war is a long enough period for the working out of clearcut ways and means of settling the German problem. This, nevertheless, is not the case.

If during the war and immediately upon its ending all the countries which were members of the anti-Hitler coalition agreed that their main common task was to ensure the development of Germany as a united peaceloving and democratic state, it became clear in the very first years after the end of the war that not all of those countries were really striving for these objectives. For some countries, including the U.S.S.R., these objectives were and still are the foundation of their policy on the German question. For other states, however, they were nothing more than words, to which they affixed their signatures without seriously meaning to carry out the agreements they signed.

The Soviet Union has stood and stands for the carrying out of the main purpose of the international agreements signed at Yalta and Potsdam. It is not a matter of this or that paragraph of these agreements, for many of them are no longer of use to anyone, having long since been outstripped by events. The main problem, in the form in which it has been raised in these important international agreements—the problem of restoring the unity of Germany as a truly peaceful and democratic state—cannot, however, be removed from the order of the day, if we hold dear the interests of peace and the freedom of the peoples of Europe. This problem will remain until it has been solved, in conformity with the interests of strengthening peace in Europe and, at the same time, with due regard to the interests of the national regeneration of a united democratic Germany. The growing peaceloving forces of the German people have a firm bulwark in the German Democratic Republic, which is fighting steadfastly for the restoration of the unity of Germany (*applause*).

It is from this viewpoint that the Paris agreements should be regarded.

Both the rejected "European Defence Community" project and the Paris agreements boil down in the final analysis to one and the same thing, both these projects pave the way for the resurgence of German militarism in Western Germany, and the integration of a remilitarised Western Germany in the aggressive military groupings of the western powers. The difference between them is not great: Whereas formerly the intention was to include the West German army in a so-called "European army," the Paris agreements propose to include it in a "West European army." The only thing that can be said to this is: "Between two evils it is not worth choosing" (*laughter, applause*).

All this is being done in direct violation of existing international agreements, bearing the signatures of the four great powers and designed to prevent the revival of German militarism. It is also a flagrant violation of both the Anglo-Soviet and the Franco-Soviet treaties, whereby Britain and France agreed, together with the U.S.S.R., to take measures against the possibility of new German aggression, and committed themselves not to take part in military groupings directed against the Soviet Union. Trampling upon these very important international agreements and treaties, signed by them jointly with the U.S.S.R., the United States, Britain and France are doing everything to push through the ratification and to speed the putting into effect of the Paris agreements.

It is with great difficulty that the Paris agreements are making their way through the European parliaments.

It is enough to say that, notwithstanding all the pressure from without, and all the United States' threats against those who do not believe in the need for the Paris agreements, it was only a minority of the deputies that voted to approve the Paris agreements in the French parliament. It was also only a minority of M.P.s that agreed to vote for the Paris agreements in the British parliament, with the Labour group deciding to abstain in a body. In Western Germany proper, the main trade union and mass party organisations of the working class which can, to a certain extent, be used as a barometer of the real sentiments of the majority of the German people, have declared themselves resolutely against the Paris agreements and against remilitarisation; for the German people, naturally, cannot forget the dire consequences for Germany of the two world wars.

What then is the value of the Paris agreements, imposed from without, condemned and spurned by the peoples of Europe?

It would be wrong, nevertheless, to underestimate the negative and downright dangerous consequences of the Paris agreements, should they be ratified and put into effect.

The danger of the ratification of the Paris agreements for the peoples of Europe consists in that they serve the purposes not of strengthening peace, but of preparing war. Are there not enough adventurers among the advocates of the "policy of strength," who so desire to unite with the rabid revenge-seekers and militarists in Western Germany?

We must also reckon with the fact that ratification of the Paris agreements would strike a terrible blow at the national interests of the German people.

Should the Paris agreements be ratified, they will become the chief obstacle to the settlement of the German problem, and they will make the re-establishment of Germany's unity impossible for a long time to come. After Western Germany has been remilitarised, and has become a militarist state, it will be impossible to unite that part of Germany with the eastern part of Germany—the peaceloving German Democratic Republic. All statements that ratification of the Paris agreements will not hinder fruitful negotiations on the re-establishment of Germany's unity have one aim, and that is to steam-roller the Paris agreements through the parliaments, making use of all means of disorientation and deception of the public for this purpose.

Abandonment of the Paris agreements and an agreement by the four powers—France, Britain, the United States and the U.S.S.R.—on the contrary, would make it possible to hold free all-German elections already this year, with the aim of re-establishing Germany's unity on a peaceful and democratic basis. That is the meaning of the Soviet government's statement on the German question, made on January 15.

Frenchmen, Belgians, Norwegians and others are being assured that the Paris agreements, which provide for the revival of the Wehrmacht, are necessary for safeguarding their security.

They are being unscrupulously deceived, when it is being asserted to them that there is danger to the security of the West European peoples from the Soviet Union and the people's democracies; those who constantly assert this know that it is an abominable and dirty slander against our peaceloving country and all the people's democracies. However, the preachers of aggressive policy control the bourgeois Press, with its large circulation, the many radio stations which vociferate from morning to night; and they also have control of the entire state machine and an army of all kinds of hired agents of capital, whose honour and conscience are for sale and who circulate any loathsome anti-Soviet lie and slander, and do it more unscrupulously and brazenly all the time, as they feel that they are losing ground (*animation in the hall*).

### III

## The Soviet Union's Efforts for Peace and for Safeguarding Collective Security

Neither slander nor inventions can conceal from the people the fact that the Soviet Union has been working consistently for peace, for the safeguarding of collective security in Europe.

The Soviet draft treaty of collective security for all European states, irrespective of the differences in their social or state systems, is well known. It met with support from a whole number of European states and found a lively response in all countries, including those in which the ruling circles are trying to pass over the Soviet Union's proposals on collective security in silence, and not infrequently are openly distorting the sense of these proposals.

The Soviet government has expressed its willingness to discuss also other proposals for European collective security. For this purpose it has recommended that a general European conference should be called, at which both the Soviet draft and other proposals that may be made to safeguard peace and European security could be discussed.

None of those opposed to the Soviet proposals, however, have advanced any other draft proposal for safeguarding European collective security. The governments of the states which are parties to the North Atlantic bloc refused to take part in the general European conference on this question. They stated that they were interested only in such treaties as those to which states of a "likemind" to members of the North Atlantic bloc adhere. Thereby they have shown how unprincipled they are with regard to their participation in the United Nations, which was set up on the basis of the recognition of the principles of equal participation in that organisation by all states, irrespective of their social systems.

By their statement they proved at the same time that they are not thinking of safeguarding peace and real security in Europe, and that their military groupings have been established with aims that are hostile to the Soviet Union and the people's democracies.

As against the Soviet Union's peaceful policy, which is aimed at safeguarding the peace and security of all European states

regardless of their social systems, they follow a policy of creating military groupings of some states against others. That makes them responsible for the aggressive plans and for their acting not in the interests of peace—and therefore not in the interests of their own people—but in the interests of the aggressive circles and ruling cliques which pursue the aggressive "policy of strength" and who are justly called warmongers.

And so, the attitude of the Soviet Union towards the Paris agreements is perfectly clear. It gives no ground for false rumours.

For us it is clear that if the Paris agreements are ratified Western Germany will embark on the path of re-establishing militarism and will actually be controlled by the German revenge-seekers. I dare say that French patriots, after hearing the splendid speeches of Edouard Herriot, realise well whither this leads:

Inasmuch as, under the Paris agreements, a remilitarised Western Germany will join both the North Atlantic bloc and the West European military alliance, together with France, Britain, Italy and some other states, a new situation will arise in Europe, as after that the danger of another war will become much greater.

This cannot but be taken into account by the Soviet Union and the people's democracies, against whom the Paris agreements are aimed. The Soviet people and their army sincerely love peace and at the same time they are filled with a deep consciousness and determination to defend their socialist gains. While aggressors got what was coming to them even before, they should not forget now that the might of the Soviet Union has grown immeasurably (*stormy applause*) and that 77 out of 100 men in our army are communists or members of the Young Communist League (*prolonged applause*). Both communists and members of the Young Communist League know particularly well how to defend the gains of communism against an aggressor (*applause*).

In view of the new situation that is taking shape in Europe, the Soviet Union—like the other peaceloving states against which the Paris agreements are spearheaded—will not sit idle. They will have to take proper measures for further strengthening their security and safeguarding European peace.

The Moscow Conference, which ended on December 2 last year and issued its firm, unanimously adopted declaration, spoke out clearly on this score. That declaration was signed by the Soviet Union, the Polish People's Republic, the Czechoslovak Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Rumanian People's Re-

public, the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the People's Republic of Albania.

The eight states that were parties to the Moscow Conference declared categorically that should the Paris agreements be ratified they would take all the necessary steps to strengthen their international positions and to safeguard peace and European security. That would require new and big efforts and material sacrifices on our part. However you may rest assured, messieurs militarists, that this will not stop us (*prolonged applause*).

First and foremost among such measures is the preparation for the conclusion of a Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance by and between the eight countries that were parties to the Moscow Conference. In order not to lose time, consultations for this purpose are now being held. Our reply to the military blocs and groupings being created together with German militarism, is the further rallying of our ranks, continued strengthening of our friendship, improving our co-operation and where necessary further extending mutual assistance (*applause*).

Among the measures that we will have to take in the event of West European military groupings being formed with the participation of a remilitarised Western Germany, the setting up of a joint military command of these eight countries should also be mentioned (*stormy applause*). This measure follows from the need to strengthen the defensive power of the Soviet Union and the other peaceloving European states, with a view to forestalling any chance accidents and surprises. When we set up a joint military command of the peaceloving European states, the aggressive circles, I dare say, will refrain from hatching adventurist schemes and will themselves behave in a more peaceful way (*applause*).

We speak of this openly and we consider it necessary to explain the present situation to our people. We are certain that the people will understand us correctly (*stormy applause*).

It is well known that the people's awareness of events that are taking place more than anything else serves the interests of peace and is the best guarantee for the safeguarding of the security of the peaceloving countries.

From all this, it is clear that Soviet foreign policy aims at maintaining and strengthening peace.

In accordance with this, we strive for such measures, for such negotiations and agreements with other countries as promote an easing of international tension. Of course, the attaining of these aims is possible only to the extent that the other side, too, shows goodwill in the same direction.

Our relations with other countries are determined, first of all, by the extent to which the development of these relations can

promote the strengthening of peace, the maintenance of peace, with the consistent observance of the principles of non-interference in the domestic affairs of other states.

What can be said about the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States?

These relations need improvement. Is such improvement in the relations between the U.S.S.R. and the United States possible? Yes, it is quite possible. For this, however, it is necessary that not only the government of the Soviet Union, but also the government of the United States desire it.

The quite good development that had recently begun in our relations with Britain and France has run up against submerged rocks or, to be more exact, the Paris agreements (*animation in the hall*), with their plans for reviving aggressive German militarism. Should matters irrevocably proceed along the road of ratifying and carrying out the Paris agreements it would mean that Britain and France not only did not value the treaties they concluded with the Soviet Union during the Second World War, but plainly annulled them, crossed them out. This would become inevitable, since the Paris agreements, opening as they do the gates to the resurgence of German militarism and the integration of a remilitarised Western Germany in anti-Soviet blocs, are compatible neither with the Anglo-Soviet nor with the Franco-Soviet treaties.

Compare the development of our country's relations with such neighbours as Finland and Norway.

Our relations with Finland are developing in conformity with the treaty of friendship, co-operation and mutual assistance of 1948. A number of facts can be quoted which testify to the development of these relations in the economic as well as the political spheres. The visit of a Finnish government delegation, headed by Mr. Kekkonen, to Moscow last year and the return visit to Finland of a Soviet government delegation, headed by Comrade A. I. Mikoyan, have promoted the further improvement of Soviet-Finnish relations, based on better mutual understanding.

As for Soviet-Norwegian relations, the Soviet Union is compelled to reckon with the fact that Norway has joined the aggressive North Atlantic bloc whose activities are by no means directed at strengthening peace in Europe. At any rate the Norwegians ought not to forget that the maintenance of good neighbourly relations between the U.S.S.R. and Norway is in the interests not only of our country, but of Norway as well.

Now about our relations with such neighbours as Turkey, Iran, and Afghanistan.

Who does not know that the Soviet Union has taken a number of steps to facilitate the improvement of relations with Turkey. The Turkish authorities, nevertheless, continue to adhere to

positions which do not conform to normal good neighbourly relations. They convert their territory and coastal waters into a sort of arena for military manoeuvres and demonstrations of foreign, and especially American, armed forces. The Soviet government considers that the mutual interests of Turkey and the U.S.S.R. dictate the necessity of maintaining good neighbourly relations between the two countries.

A certain improvement has begun in our relations with Iran. After prolonged negotiations, a Soviet-Iranian agreement has been signed on important frontier and financial matters. We hope that the further development of Soviet-Iranian relations in this direction will not be hindered by the unceasing pressure upon Iran from foreign aggressive forces, who have set themselves the aim of drawing that country into their aggressive military and political groupings in the Near and Middle East.

Our relations with Afghanistan are developing normally, and we consider that this accords with the interests of both countries.

We note with great satisfaction the further strengthening of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and India.

Both political and economic, and cultural relations are developing successfully and are helping to bring closer together the peoples of our countries, who have mutual respect for and sincere sympathy with each other.

We have recently concluded an important economic agreement. Under this agreement the Soviet Union has undertaken, on long term credits at easy rates, to build in India a big iron and steel plant with an annual output of more than a million tons of steel and a corresponding amount of rolled metal. The Soviet Union will supply all the equipment and will render the necessary technical aid, including the sending of highly qualified specialists. We gladly complied with the relevant request, since the development of the iron and steel industry in India should help to secure the national independence and economic progress of this great and ancient country, with which the peoples of the Soviet Union wholeheartedly sympathise (*prolonged applause*).

Next summer, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India is to visit the Soviet Union (*applause*). The Soviet people have responded in a most friendly way to the news of Mr. Nehru's forthcoming visit (*applause*).

Our relations with two other Asian countries, Burma and Indonesia, also continue to grow stronger.

In the relations of the Soviet Union with the Arab countries, excepting Iraq, positive facts can be noted of late.

That Iraq broke off political relations with the U.S.S.R. can be explained chiefly by the fact that the present Iraq government is in too much of a hurry to dance to the tune of the

“western” imperialists (*laughter*). The Arab countries most likely know of the friendly feelings of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. for them, and of the fact that in the Soviet Union they have had and will continue to have a reliable support in the defence of their sovereignty and national independence (*applause*).

It is well known that the Soviet Union is striving to make normal its relations with Japan.

The Soviet Union has lately established direct contact with the government of Japan and we expect appropriate positive results.

The Soviet Union attaches great importance to the settling of the Austrian question, the question of the full restoration of the independence of a democratic Austria, in line with the interests of maintaining and strengthening peace in Europe.

The Soviet government considers any further delay in the conclusion of a state treaty with Austria unjustified. At the same time, one cannot but take into account the dangers for Austria which plans to remilitarise Western Germany, such as the Paris agreements, mean.

All this gives the Soviet Union grounds for arriving at the following conclusions with regard to the Austrian question:

1. It is necessary first and foremost to reckon with the fact that the settlement of the Austrian issue cannot be considered apart from the German problem, particularly in view of the existing plans to remilitarise Western Germany, which intensify the danger of an Anschluss.

This means that, in concluding a state treaty for the restoration of an independent and democratic Austria, such a solution must be found as would preclude the possibility of Germany carrying out a new Anschluss, which involves the taking of appropriate agreed measures by the four powers on the German question. In this event the withdrawal of the troops of the four powers from Austria could be carried out without waiting for the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany.

2. Austria must undertake not to join any coalitions or military alliances directed against any power that took part with its armed forces in the war against Hitler Germany and in liberating Austria, and not to permit the establishment of foreign military bases on its territory.

The governments of the United States, Britain, France and the Soviet Union, for their part, must similarly undertake to carry out these provisions.

3. For the earliest settlement of the Austrian issue, a four-power conference must be called without delay, to examine the German problem as well as the question of concluding a state treaty with Austria. This, naturally, presupposes Austria's participation in deciding the question of an Austrian state treaty.

It should, however, be borne in mind that, in the event of the Paris agreements, which open the way for the resurgence of militarism in Western Germany, being ratified, a serious danger of an Anschluss would be created and consequently a threat to Austria's independence.

It is well known that successes have been achieved recently in the relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

We do not consider that everything has already been done in this direction, but we believe that this depends no less upon Yugoslavia also. In recent years Yugoslavia has, apparently, departed to some degree from the course she embarked upon during the first years after the Second World War. And this, of course, is entirely her own domestic concern. The Soviet Union strives to develop Soviet-Yugoslav relations in the economic, political and cultural spheres. At the same time we strive for a possible concerting of efforts in a matter of such decisive importance to all peoples as the safeguarding of peace and international security. We are convinced that the positive trend in the development of Soviet-Yugoslav relations is in the interests both of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. and those of Yugoslavia.

I have already had occasion to speak on how relations are developing between the Soviet Union and such people's democracies as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria and Albania, and also with the German Democratic Republic. Our relations with these countries are developing successfully on the basis of brotherly friendship and over-all co-operation, in the interests of strengthening peace and improving the well-being of the broad masses of the people.

In the east, similar relations of brotherly friendship and wide co-operation are developing between our country and the People's Republic of China, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic and the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam.

We are bound to the great People's Republic of China by ties of friendship and fraternal relations, which are growing stronger from year to year (*prolonged applause*).

Last year's visit to China by a Soviet government delegation, headed by Comrades N. S. Khrushchov, N. A. Bulganin, A. I. Mikoyan and N. M. Shvernik, and the conclusion by it of important agreements both for economic co-operation and co-operation in international affairs, are a graphic expression of these new socialist relations between two great countries.

The Soviet Union strives to maintain with these countries, and with all other states, such relations as would promote general peace and international security. We note with great joy that the people's democracies, both in Europe and in Asia, give this

policy every support and, together with the Soviet Union, pursue consistently a policy designed to ease international tension (*applause*).

Friendly co-operation in all spheres, political, economic and cultural, has been established between the Soviet Union and the people's democracies, and it is growing stronger all the time. This co-operation is founded on the consistent observance of the principles of sovereignty and national independence. In cases of necessity, of course, it also extends to the consolidation of the defence capacity of all these countries.

But the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist camp have not set up and are not setting up any military blocs directed against other states. Nor will they do so in the future, but they will be compelled to unite their forces in order to safeguard their security if aggressive plans, with the help of which it is intended to revive German militarism and prepare an attack on the peaceful states, continue to be carried out.

Until now the countries of the socialist camp have had no need to unite their military efforts. As for the necessary unity between them in all spheres, it has been reached and is being reached through businesslike contact, co-operation and mutual assistance, sealed by unbreakable friendship and fraternal relations.

As a result of this, the twelve countries including the U.S.S.R. and the people's democracies, with a total population of 900 million, represent a monolithic camp of peace, democracy and socialism (*applause*). The working people who stand at the helm of power in these countries have no difficulty in agreeing among themselves on all essential questions and are not divided by the jungle customs and bestial competition prevailing among the imperialists.

In so far, however, as the Soviet Union upholds the cause of general peace and the inviolability of the principles of sovereignty and national independence of the peoples, irrespective of their social systems, the foreign policy of the Soviet state is also supported by other peoples, by other countries, both big and small.

The U.S.S.R. cannot underestimate, for example, the fact that India and Burma, together with the People's Republic of China have proclaimed the five principles of peaceful co-operation among states (co-existence, non-interference in domestic affairs, non-aggression, etc.) upon which the Soviet Union has always based its foreign policy, and which have now found such friendly support throughout the world.

We have a right to ask the governments and parliaments of all countries: why could not these peaceful principles, formulated now in the Indian-Chinese declaration of June 28, 1954,

become a common platform for the maintenance and consolidation of peace for all nations? (*applause*).

The peaceful policy of the Soviet Union has its numerous and reliable friends in the countries of the capitalist camp as well.

You know who these friends of ours are.

They are, first and foremost, the working class who want war nowhere, and in whose ranks the number of active fighters against the warmongers, for the consolidation of peace among nations, is steadily growing. Millions of peasants, to whom war brings nothing but calamities and misfortune, have also given and are giving friendly support to the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union. The movement of peace supporters is growing in the towns and the countryside far beyond the bounds of the socialist camp, among all sections of the population, including the propertied classes, and all Soviet men and women rejoice in each real success of this movement for peace, for the development of normal relations among states.

As for the foreign policy of the United States and the countries which follow the American foreign policy line, in many cases it runs in the opposite direction.

While the Soviet Union stands for the expansion of trade relations with other countries and for the development of international trade, the ruling circles of the United States follow a directly opposite line with regard to the U.S.S.R. and the other democratic countries.

What did the United States not do in order to hamper Soviet foreign trade, to block the economic relations of China with other countries, to retard, and if possible to strangle the trade of the democratic countries with countries dependent on the United States?

For this purpose the government and Congress of the United States have adopted in recent years many laws and decisions of all kinds. Their senators and cabinet members have delivered all sorts of speeches with threats against disobedient states. For the same purposes, a whole stack of American supervisory committees of every kind have been set up in order that—God forbid!—some American, Chilean, British, Danish, West German or Italian businessman should not sell his goods, produced for the foreign market, to the Soviet Union or Bulgaria, China or Hungary. In doing so, the United States resorts to such measures of pressure and direct *diktat*, that many manufacturers and businessmen are seriously intimidated and are afraid to develop trade with other countries.

It is strange, however, that the United States to this day does not understand that these measures miss their mark.

Despite all the impediments and discriminatory measures taken by the American authorities against the U.S.S.R. and the

people's democracies, the foreign trade of these countries with the capitalist states has not been disrupted. Moreover, this aggressive policy has brought about the accelerated development of economic relations between the countries of the democratic camp. And this, in turn, has facilitated the strengthening of both economic and political relations among the democratic countries.

Certain American leaders from among those who were particularly zealous in hampering the foreign trade of the U.S.S.R., counted on retarding postwar economic rehabilitation in our country. They thought that decades would be required for the Soviet Union to rehabilitate its prewar economy. But has not the discussion on the State Budget at this session of the Supreme Soviet once again demonstrated how disgracefully they have miscalculated?

I shall cite only one illustration on this point.

None of you have any doubts whatsoever that the State Budget and the national economic plan approved for 1955 will be successfully carried out. By fulfilling this year's national economic plan, our industry will attain a level which will be more than three times the prewar level of industrial output in our country (*stormy applause*).

Add to this the fact that in agriculture, in collective farm and state farm construction, work is now getting under way on the basis of the recent decisions of the Communist Party and the Soviet government, which will lead to another unprecedented development. The new and really entrancing tasks set in this sphere will require further great efforts by the Soviet state. But it is perfectly clear that the collective farms and state farms, which have now grown stronger, can measure up to them, not to mention the fact that due support will be rendered by the whole great Soviet people in the accomplishing of these prime tasks (*prolonged applause*).

As for trade relations, let it be known: we are for the development of normal international trade and for sound economic co-operation. Is there anything wrong if honest economic competition develops between the capitalist and socialist systems? Indeed, perhaps nothing else and nothing better can be invented in the middle of the 20th century (*applause*).

## IV

# The Aggressive Policy of the United States is a Threat to Peace

While, in the economic sphere, the American "policy of strength" leads to all kinds of obstacles and discriminatory measures in international trade, in the military and political sphere it is chiefly expressed in the establishment of all sorts of military and political blocs and aggressive groupings.

As we know, the North Atlantic grouping, set up by the Anglo-American bloc under the ægis of the United States, is prominent in this respect. It includes the United States of America, Britain, France, Italy, Canada, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxemburg, Denmark, Norway, Iceland, Portugal, Greece and Turkey.

In addition, there are also other military and political groupings, also set up under the ægis of the United States.

Of these the following could be mentioned, the establishment of which have been given legal form in various treaties or agreements during recent years: The treaty between the United States, Australia and New Zealand; the treaty between the United States and Japan; the South-east Asian treaty (S.E.A.T.O.); the treaty between the United States and the bankrupt Chiang Kai-shek (*laughter*); the treaty between the United States and the Syngman Rhee clique in South Korea; the treaty between the United States, France, Bao-Dai Viet Nam, Laos and Cambodia. It is clear to everyone what the significance is of such treaties and agreements with the United States, which aim to support in some way the Chiang Kai-shek clique on Taiwan, detested by the Chinese people, the fascist Syngman Rhee grouping in South Korea, and Bao-Dai, who is rejected by the Viet Nameese people.

In this group of blocs set up under the ægis of the United States, can be included the recent agreement between Turkey and Pakistan as well as the agreement now being prepared between Turkey and Iraq.

The Paris agreements provide for the establishment of a West European military alliance which is to become, so to speak, the

assault column of the North Atlantic bloc. The West European military alliance includes, besides France, Britain, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxemburg, Western Germany also. There is no need to add anything to that, about this military alliance.

In an entirely special position is the treaty between Turkey, Greece and Yugoslavia, insofar as only two of its members belong to the North Atlantic bloc while the third, Yugoslavia, does not belong to that bloc. The Balkan peoples, however, cannot but display corresponding caution and attention in this respect.

The military blocs and groupings which the United States is building up in Europe are spearheaded against the Soviet Union and the people's democracies, and in Asia against the People's Republic of China and the peoples friendly with it.

Matters, however, are not confined to the establishment of blocs and groupings.

One must not underestimate the danger of the ever-continued arms drive. In such countries as the United States, Britain, France and certain other states the military budgets are already unusually inflated. In the United States, military expenditures comprise two-thirds of the entire federal budget and are several times greater than the prewar outlays for the same purposes.

The present level of output of the highly-developed industry of the United States is maintained chiefly by war orders. The output of the war industry comprises from 20 to 25 per cent., that is almost a quarter, of the total production of American industry. And this notwithstanding, economic crisis and decline in gross output are making themselves felt in the United States.

It is high time to admit that the economy of a country cannot be sustained for a long time on such an unsound foundation as war orders. Yet, the United States is pursuing the suicidal policy of disrupting international trade, which robs American industry of normal channels for its development and expansion.

It is not accidental that, for the fifth year now, the United States government keeps the country in a so-called "state of emergency." This was started by Truman's Democrat administration and is continued by the present Republican administration.

Things have been carried even farther of late, in order to keep up the atmosphere of war hysteria whipped up there. A vicious campaign has been started in the Press and on the radio, with all manner of discussion not merely about war in general but also, in particular, about the preparations for atomic war. The responsibility for this rests primarily with the ruling circles of America. It was on their insistence that the N.A.T.O. members met in Paris in mid-December, 1954, to discuss the preparation of atomic war.

Not wishing to lag behind the others, some Foreign Ministers have recently been indulging in some atomic war propaganda of their own.

Thus the Belgian Foreign Minister, Spaak, bragging somewhat at a press conference in Paris on December 18, 1954, declared that the decisions adopted by the Atlantic Council the day before "give the military exactly what they need. They wanted permission to prepare for an atomic war. This permission has been granted." Resorting to some diplomatic haziness, he also spoke of the so-called "hypothesis of the use of atomic weapons," declaring coyly: "The final decision and the means that make it possible to take it (i.e., the decision to use atomic weapons) cannot be made public. They are a top military secret."

The propaganda of atomic war has recently been taken up by both Spaak and Dulles. It has been taken up not only by the American generals Radford, Gruenther and Stevenson, but also by the talkative British Field-Marshal, Montgomery (*animation in the hall*).

Can it be that they want to show thereby that the recent projects and speeches of American statesmen on the peaceful utilisation of atomic energy were only meant to distract the attention of the wide public?

If there is even a grain of truth in this supposition, it will doubly prejudice American foreign policy. It should not be forgotten that, firstly, such a double-faced policy is undermining the peoples' confidence in the governments and that, secondly, in some of today's atom-mongers, the peoples already now see candidates for new chief war criminals (*applause*).

All this taken together—namely, the many obstacles raised by the United States in the sphere of international trade, the aggressive war blocs, the numerous military bases that are being set up on the territories of other countries, the arms drive, and the threat of atomic war—all this is meant to show that the United States and the American bloc of states are pursuing a "policy of strength," spearheaded against the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, and the people's democracies. All this is meant to use the "positions of strength" policy—that is to say, the policy of pressure and threats—to browbeat someone, to confuse someone. But this entire war of nerves is costing the American people themselves too much, and gives nothing to the United States of America for strengthening its foreign political positions.

The United States aggressive circles have again miscalculated. Only recently they thought they had the complete monopoly of atomic weapons. Even the more far-sighted of them believed in the first postwar years that it would take the Soviet Union at

least 10 to 15 years to manufacture atomic weapons, while the majority thought that it would take much longer. But Soviet scientists, engineers, technicians and all others directly concerned have in a short time secured the results that point to the exceptional possibilities of the Soviet state. It has come to a point where the Soviet people have made such progress in the manufacture of hydrogen weapons that it is the United States that is lagging behind, and not the Soviet Union (*stormy, prolonged applause*).

At home, too, present United States' foreign policy is far from meeting with universal support.

The Republican Party no longer has a majority in Congress. Since last autumn's elections, the majority in the American Congress belongs to the Democrat Party. In this connection, it would not be out of place to quote from the most prominent Democrat leader in the United States, Stevenson, who was the Democrat nominee in the 1952 presidential elections. Here, according to the American Press, is what he said at a Democrat Party meeting on September 8, 1954:

"I have found it hard sometimes to separate our policy from our pronouncements and our slogans—those glamorous phrases and catch policies; we seem to have slogan policies—Dulles sound and Knowland fury, signifying nothing and accomplishing less. You remember all the exciting, bold labels—'liberation,' 'unleashing Chiang Kai-shek,' 'seizing initiative,' 'new look' in defence, 'massive retaliation,' etc. One by one they have come creeping home [*laughter*] leaving a little more of our prestige and influence behind. . . . It is sorry enough that the sordid spectacle of family quarrelling in Washington has created dismay among our allies. Far worse is the paralysis which seems to have settled on the State Department. Secretary Dulles is undoubtedly right in saying that the times call for 'agonising reappraisal' of our foreign relations. But the trouble is that no sensible reappraisal is possible in the atmosphere in which the word 'negotiate' has become a synonym for 'treachery'" (*animation in the hall*).

Coming from such a competent person as a former Presidential nominee, this estimate of the American foreign policy quoted merits attention. It would not be bad if, to some extent, it awoke those directly concerned (*laughter, applause*).

It should be said, however, that this assessment of the foreign policy of the United States far from fully reveals the existing contradictions and the real state of affairs that has developed in this sphere.

Indeed, whereas the camp of socialism and democracy is strong because of the unity of its political aims and the great interna-

tional friendship among the working people, the camp of imperialism is being torn asunder by external and internal contradictions. All that inevitably affects foreign policy too.

Many examples can be cited to prove this.

Here are the facts.

Recall the Geneva Conference. There an agreement was reached between France, Britain, China and the U.S.S.R. on the re-establishment of peace in Indo-China, although the third partner of the North Atlantic bloc, namely, the United States, did not want to subscribe to that agreement. True, later, at the Manila Conference, the representatives of the United States, France and Britain came to some understanding among themselves. That time France and Britain joined with the United States and to a certain extent came out against the decisions of the Geneva Conference, which had been adopted with their participation. Does this not, however, speak of the piles of contradictions in the imperialist camp, contradictions which make themselves felt now in one form and now in another, now with greater and now with lesser force? Is it not clear, however, that despite the certain kind of "achievement" scored by the United States at the Manila Conference, the political results of the Geneva Conference are incomparably more significant than the petty results of the Manila Conference?

In the spring of 1952, in May, the governments of six West European states signed under pressure from the United States and Britain a treaty providing for the setting up of the so-called "European Defence Community." However, in August, 1954, the French parliament rejected that treaty and they had to bid farewell to the plans for setting up a "European Defence Community." That treaty failed in the French parliament because too great differences between the will of the French people and the intentions of the French government came to the surface. How should this fact be assessed? There is every ground for saying that the failure of the "European Defence Community" was brought about as a result of deep-going contradictions in the imperialist camp. And also, one must agree that that was one of the defeats suffered by the aggressive line of American foreign policy.

After that, on October 23, 1954, the so-called Paris agreements, which are another attempt to steam-roller through the remilitarisation of Western Germany, were signed. Things seemed to be going along nicely and the governments of some European countries and the United States were already counting on a victory in putting through their plan for the re-establishment of German militarism. But in recent days the French parliament has again begun to vacillate, which may cause new difficulties for the champions of the Paris agreements. Seen here is the influence

of the sharpening contradictions in one of the sections of the military and political bloc is under the ægis of the United States. The events which took place in France in recent days and which led to the government crisis testify to still another defeat for the American line of foreign policy.

Take a look at how foreign policy matters were reflected in the United States of America during the presidential elections in the autumn of 1952.

As we know, in those elections the victor was the Republican Party, which supported the policy of the so-called "liberation" of the people's democracies, although it did this in a hesitating voice. This policy of "liberation" was, to a certain extent, put up by the Republicans against the policy of the Democrat Party, which by and large adhered to a more moderate line of foreign policy, known as the policy of "containment," although the champions of both these political lines are to be found in both parties.

It should not be forgotten, however, that immediately before the elections, Eisenhower, the candidate of the Republican Party, promised to end the war in Korea, in which the United States had become involved when Truman's Democrat Party was in power.

In the main this is what decided the outcome of the presidential elections.

The defeat of the Democrats in the presidential elections is to be explained not by the fact that the Democrats followed the more moderate foreign policy line, but by the fact that they were responsible for unleashing the war in Korea. On the other hand, the Republicans won the presidential elections not because they proclaimed a more aggressive line of foreign policy but on the contrary, by virtue of the fact that they actually appeared to be, for a certain time, the political party which was furthering not the continuation of aggression in Korea but the ending of the war and the re-establishment of peace in that country.

We have to take into account also the contradictions existing in the blocs and military groupings that are being set up by the imperialists, be it the North Atlantic bloc or something else. In all these groupings, the tendencies in favour of speeding up the launching of another war grow stronger, interchangeably with the contrary trends. While a struggle between these kinds of opposite tendencies is going on within some countries, it is reflected the more plainly within the blocs, and even between them.

Moreover, we have to take into account that these vacillations and, what is especially important, the vacillations which are of importance for easing international tension will appear stronger and the more often, the more organised and the more energetic

the unfolding of the people's movement for peace and for the easing of international relations in all countries.

The examples quoted are typical of the many contradictions in the imperialist camp, which are reflected in the relations between some countries and also in the policy of individual governments and even in individual parties, which have to take into account, in some measure, not only the will of the millionaires and billionaires, but also the opinion of wide sections of the voters.

Soviet foreign policy cannot help taking into account the important contradictions both between individual capitalist countries, and within those countries, and even within some parties belonging to capitalist classes and groups. It is our task to utilise these contradictions in the interest of supporting and strengthening peace and weakening the aggressive anti-democratic forces.

## V

# Our Principal Task is to Strengthen Peace

A deep gulf lies between us, champions of a lasting peace, and our adversaries.

Our adversaries are busy with their arms drive. They grasped at it, hoping to strengthen their political camp, but actually it leads to the inevitable weakening and undermining of their economic and political positions.

As against their arms drive, the Soviet Union poses its peaceful policy and its proposals for a substantial reduction of all armaments and unconditional prohibition of atomic weapons with the establishment of effective international control over the reduction of armaments, as well as the prohibition of atomic or other weapons of mass destruction.

Our adversaries are openly working for another war and have recently launched a blather of propaganda around the need of organising precisely an atomic war. They will, however, never get their own peoples' approval for this aggressive policy, which is rejected not only by the broad masses of the people, but also by the more sober-minded section of the wealthy classes. By following such a line of policy, all they are accomplishing is that certain particularly clamorous statesmen have already discredited themselves in advance, both in their own country and abroad.

On the atomic question also the Soviet Union takes an opposite stand.

The Soviet government has already proposed to the government of the United States to conclude an agreement without delay to renounce the use of atomic weapons and to employ atomic energy exclusively for peaceful purposes. The Soviet Union is fully willing to support also the recent recommendations of the World Peace Council to have all countries destroy their stocks of atomic weapons, so that the peoples all over the world may be sure that atomic warfare will never be allowed. That is why the Soviet Union shows such willingness and activity in the calling of an international conference for the peaceful utilisation of atomic energy. We propose to the United States that it compete not in the production of atomic weapons but in using atomic energy for peaceful purposes (*applause*).

Our adversaries shout about the "positions of strength" policy. They are nervous and at the same time they threaten. They resort to threats and blackmail, thinking that they are dealing with weak-nerved and unstable people.

The Soviet government believes that those who resort to such poor methods with respect to the Soviet people will surely fail. They should know that, if it comes to it, we will know how to defend ourselves (*prolonged applause*).

It is high time to realise that the situation as regards the correlation of forces between the U.S.S.R. and the United States is already fully clear.

If we are to compare the Soviet Union with all its manpower, its immense material resources, and all its allies abroad and, moreover, if we take into account the moral and political support given to the policy of peace by the masses of the people in other countries—if, then, we compare the Soviet Union such as it already is at the present time with the United States of America, and if we take that country also with all of these elements, it becomes clear that the Soviet Union is not weaker than the United States of America (*loud, prolonged applause*).

Neither should it be forgotten that the Soviet Union has the indisputable advantage over the United States in that the peace-loving Soviet Union threatens no one and does not interfere in the affairs of other states, but instead defends a really right and just cause which has the ardent sympathy of the working people and all oppressed peoples throughout the world, and which cannot but win (*loud applause*).

What does the Soviet Union propose?

We propose that neither side resort to the policy of threats and blackmail. That will lead to nothing good.

Moreover, we believe that the side which is really confident of its strength will not favour war. Those who are confident of

their strength, those who are confident of their future, have no need for that.

Any gambling with the unleashing of a new world war would inevitably end sadly for the aggressor, because in our days hundreds of millions of people have already attained such a level of consciousness that they, like all the Soviet people, will fight to the end against such criminal aggression, with full conviction of the justice of their cause.

It is not "world civilisation" which would perish, however much it suffers from fresh aggression, but it is the already decayed moribund social system with its imperialist foundation, drenched in blood, a system which is condemned for its aggressiveness and doomed for its exploitation of the working people and the oppressed peoples (*prolonged applause*).

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union is based on Lenin's principles of the co-existence of different social systems. We uphold these principles because we want the peoples to live in peace and tranquillity.

We uphold these principles because in co-existence there is a full possibility to ensure, for a whole historical period, peace and freedom for the peoples and peaceful relations among countries, and continued human progress.

We stand for the Leninist principles of co-existence and we stand for these principles because we are confident of the forces of socialism and are confident that we have chosen the right road to communism (*loud, prolonged applause. All rise*).

**RESOLUTION**  
**of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR**  
**on the Report of**  
**V. M. MOLOTOV**  
**on the International Situation and the**  
**Foreign Policy of the Soviet Government**

**H**AVING heard and discussed the report of Deputy V. M. Molotov, First Vice-Chairman of the Council of Ministers and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., on the International Situation and the Foreign Policy of the Soviet Government, the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics *resolves:*

To approve the foreign policy of the Soviet Government.

Moscow, The Kremlin, February 9, 1955  
(from *Pravda*, February 10, 1955)

## 'SOVIET NEWS' BOOKLETS

<b>New Paths of Soviet Science</b> by Oleg Pisarzhevsky	6d.
<b>Higher Education in the U.S.S.R.</b> by I. G. Petrovsky	6d.
<b>Education in the U.S.S.R.</b> by Prof. Y. N. Medynsky	6d.
<b>The U.S.S.R.—100 Questions Answered.</b> Revised	1/6d.
<b>Soviet Women</b> by O. Vinogradova	3d.
<b>Creative Freedom and the Soviet Artist</b> by Marietta Shaginyan	3d.
<b>European Security—Soviet Plan</b> by D. Melnikov	1d.
<b>East-West Trade</b> by V. Spandaryan	2d.
<b>Freedom of Religion in the U.S.S.R.</b> Second revised edition by G. Spasov	2d.
<b>Moscow Conference for European Security</b> November 29—December 2, 1954	1d.
<b>Property (Public and Private) in the U.S.S.R.</b>	1d.
<b>For European Security</b> Note to France, Great Britain and U.S.A. V. M. Molotov's Speech, Note to France—Dec. 1954	1d.
<b>Note to Britain (December 1954) and Text of Anglo-Soviet Treaty</b>	1d.
<b>10 Questions on European Security</b> by N. Inozemtsev	1d.
<b>Soviet Housing</b> by Y. Yaralov	3d.
<b>Soviet Constitution.</b> New printing	6d.
<b>Great Constructions in the Land of the Soviets</b> by N. Mikhailov	3d.
<b>Soviet Leaders Give Interviews to American Journalists</b>	1d.

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