

Soviet Socialist Republics once more calls upon the governments of the United States, Great Britain, France and Canada with the proposal that, pending the reaching of agreement on other disarmament questions, agreement be reached without delay on the urgent primary measures of disarmament.

The Soviet government, taking into account the insistent demands of the peoples, proposes in the first place that agreement be reached on the immediate and unconditional prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests or on the temporary suspension of such tests for 2 or 3 years, with the establishment of appropriate control, without this measure being made contingent on the realisation of other steps in the field of disarmament.

The Soviet government likewise proposes that agreement be reached on carrying out partial disarmament measures, providing for the renunciation by the states of the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons; the reduction of the armed forces of the states to definite levels; the reduction of the armaments and military budgets of the states; elimination of foreign military bases on the territory of other countries; reduction of the armed forces of the United States, the U.S.S.R., Britain and France in Germany; the establishment of international control over the implementation of disarmament measures.

The Soviet government submitted corresponding proposals on disarmament questions for the consideration of the United Nations Disarmament Sub-Committee on March 18, April 30, and June 14, 1957.

The problem of disarmament awaits solution. It is necessary to go over from fruitless discussions to deeds. It is important to take the first step in disarmament with a view to clearing the road for the gradual solution of this problem as a whole, which, given good will, can undoubtedly be solved. This object would be greatly facilitated by open discussion of disarmament questions in the United Nations with the participation not only of five countries, but also of the other states who are vitally interested in the solution of the disarmament problem.

As far as the Soviet government is concerned, it will continue in the future to exert every effort for the speediest solution of this most important problem of the day.

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

# DISARMAMENT

## Soviet Government Statement

August 27, 1957

"Soviet News"

Booklet No. 14

3<sup>D.</sup>

489

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>



## DISARMAMENT SOVIET GOVERNMENT STATEMENT

*V. A. Zorin, the U.S.S.R. representative on the United Nations Disarmament Sub-Committee, read this statement of the Soviet government to the Sub-Committee at its meeting on August 27.*

FOR more than ten years disarmament talks have been going on in the United Nations. The United Nations Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee have been in existence for many years and they have been set a most important task by the United Nations General Assembly: to work out an international agreement on disarmament that would ensure the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons and a substantial reduction in the armaments and armed forces of the states, with the establishment of appropriate international control over these measures. Never before has mankind faced such a vital and burning international problem as the disarmament problem, the problem of the prohibition of atomic weapons, on which is focused the attention of the people of the whole world. This is only natural, for unless there is a positive solution of the disarmament problem no country can feel itself free of the threat of a new war with the use of weapons of mass destruction, atom and hydrogen bombs. The fate of millions upon millions of people in various parts of the world today depends on whether the powers reach agreement on practical steps in the field of disarmament. It is precisely for this reason, therefore, that the peoples are demanding with increasing insistence the immediate adoption of measures to put an end to the armaments race and first and foremost to remove the danger of atomic war.

### *The Disarmament Sub-Committee Marks Time and the Armaments Race Continues*

THE work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee so far has not yielded positive results. Anyone who today tries to suggest to world public opinion that the disarmament talks that have been going on in London at the Sub-Committee session for five months are proceeding normally, speaks an untruth. During the whole of this time the Sub-Committee has not taken a single step forward in solving the tasks set before it. Meanwhile the governments of the western powers have developed on a still greater scale the production of all forms of armaments, and particularly, such means for the mass annihilation of human beings as atomic and hydrogen weapons.

While the United Nations Disarmament Sub-Committee has been meeting in London, the Council of the aggressive North Atlantic bloc at its recent session in Bonn has adopted a decision to place atomic weapons at the disposal of a number of West European member-states of that bloc, including Western Germany.

The United States government, disregarding the determined protests of the peoples of many countries, has begun to station its special-purpose atomic formations on the territories of West-European member-states of N.A.T.O. All this is taking place, in actual fact, under the cloak of the fruitless talks on disarmament.

It is, therefore, no cause for surprise that the peoples begin with increasing frequency to ask the reasons for such a situation. They wish to know whether the states represented on the Sub-Committee are truly endeavouring to reach the vitally important goal—disarmament, and whether they are doing everything necessary for this. No one can avoid answering these questions, for the problem of disarmament profoundly affects the interests of literally every family, each person, in whatever country these people may live. The extremely unsatisfactory situation as regards the disarmament talks which have been going on now for many years and remain fruitless to this day, arouses legitimate anxiety and widespread alarm. It is becoming increasingly obvious to them that those who are responsible for the policy of the governments of the western powers represented in the United Nations Disarmament Sub-Committee, and first and foremost the United States, in reality do not desire an agreement on disarmament. True, there is no lack of widely publicised state-

ments on the part of these leaders regarding the desirability of disarmament. But how much are these statements worth if the practical work of the governments of the United States and its N.A.T.O. allies are directed at continuing the armaments race and strengthening the militarisation of their countries, at preparations for atomic war?

It is not difficult to understand what compels the opponents of disarmament to have recourse to such manoeuvres. Faced with a universal, powerful growth of the peace movement, and a situation in which the peace-loving forces in all countries are demanding with increasing persistence that a policy of peaceful co-existence be pursued and the armaments race ended, no government can allow itself to oppose the demands openly without risking indignation among its own people as a result of its policy. This is why the ruling circles of the western powers play a double game, and with the object of deceiving public opinion, mask their military preparations with talk about disarmament, try to create the impression that something real is being done in the United Nations Sub-Committee, though in actual fact the Sub-Committee is marking time.

The government of the Soviet Union, which is a member of the United Nations Disarmament Commission's Sub-Committee, realising the importance of the tasks confronting the Sub-Committee, and its responsibility to the peoples, considers it its duty to make clear its position on the question of disarmament and how it assesses the talks on this question that are going on.

### *U.S.S.R. Calls for the Speediest Achievement of Agreement on Disarmament*

THE Soviet Union's attitude to the disarmament talks is determined first of all by the fact that the basis of the whole of the foreign policy of the U.S.S.R. is the principle of the peaceful co-existence of states regardless of differences of social systems, the desire to lessen international tension, to maintain friendly relations and develop peaceful co-operation with all peoples. The Soviet government has endeavoured to make the Sub-Committee's work as effective as possible and to ensure the speedy adoption of appropriate decisions. With this in mind, even before the present session of the Sub-Committee began the Soviet government proposed that it be held this time at Foreign Ministry level with the participation of responsible representatives of the military departments, preferably the heads of military

staffs. Unfortunately, the western powers represented on the Sub-Committee rejected this proposal of the Soviet Union, and this in itself could not fail to have a detrimental effect on the Sub-Committee's work.

Right at the beginning of the present session of the Sub-Committee the government of the U.S.S.R. presented for its examination proposals containing a broad disarmament programme. This programme provided for the total prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, the renunciation of their use by the states, the cessation of their production, their withdrawal from the armaments of the states and the destruction of stock-piles of these weapons. In the field of conventional armaments the programme provided for a reduction in the armed forces of the Soviet Union and the United States in two stages to the level of 1,000,000-1,500,000 men, and of Britain and France to the level of 650,000 men. The Soviet Union also proposed that agreement be reached on the liquidation by the states of all foreign military bases on the territory of other countries; on a reduction in the armed forces of the U.S.S.R., the United States, Great Britain and France stationed on the territory of Germany; on a reduction in the armed forces of the United States, Great Britain and France stationed on the territory of N.A.T.O. member-countries and on the territory of other foreign countries and of the armed forces of the U.S.S.R. stationed on the territory of Warsaw Treaty member-countries.

Together with this it provided for the establishment of a system of international control over the implementation of these measures by the states. The Soviet Union also proposed the use of aerial photographic inspection in the areas in Europe where the main armed forces of the N.A.T.O. and Warsaw Treaty countries are stationed to a depth of 800 kilometres respectively either side of the line dividing the N.A.T.O. forces and the forces of the Warsaw Treaty member-countries. It was also proposed that a zone of limitation and inspection of armaments be established in Europe, to include the territory of both parts of Germany and also adjacent countries.

In drawing up the Soviet Union's proposals, account was taken of the position of the western powers and of the considerations expressed by many states during the Eleventh Session of the United Nations General Assembly. Nevertheless these proposals of the Soviet government did not meet with support from the Sub-Committee representatives of the United States, Britain, France and Canada. Pleading that in general they were

not prepared at the present time to agree to a radical solution of the disarmament problem, the representatives of these countries declared that they intended to conduct the talks with the sole aim of reaching an agreement on partial measures in the field of disarmament.

Though the Soviet government advocates the immediate solution of the disarmament problem in its entirety, it took into account the western powers' position and, guided by the desire to shift the question of disarmament out of its state of deadlock, on April 30 made the proposal that partial measures be carried out in the field of disarmament, measures that in the present situation are urgent and the realisation of which would at the same time pave the way to an all-embracing agreement on disarmament.

The Soviet proposals in the field of partial disarmament provided for a reduction in armed forces, armaments and military appropriations, and also included a clause regarding the gradual liquidation of foreign military bases on the territory of other countries and a number of measures directed at lessening international tension.

Taking into account the categorical refusal of the United States and its allies to agree to the total prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, on April 30 the Soviet Union proposed that as a first step the states assume the solemn undertaking to renounce the use for military purposes of all forms of atomic and hydrogen weapons, including aerial bombs, rockets of any type with atomic or hydrogen warheads, atomic artillery, and so on.

In view of the particular urgency of the question of ending atomic and hydrogen weapon tests, these proposals of the Soviet Union envisaged the separation of this question from the general problem of disarmament, with the object of solving this question without delay as an immediate measure.

### *Atomic and Hydrogen Weapon Tests Must Be Ended Without Delay*

THE struggle for ending nuclear weapon tests in recent years has become world wide. Millions of ordinary people in every country of the world are insistently demanding that the dangerous experiments with atomic and hydrogen weapons must be stopped. The recent Colombo session of the World Peace Council, expressing the will of the peoples of the world,

addressed an appeal to all societies, movements, organisations, unions, groups and individuals fighting for the ending of atomic tests, to join in the common efforts, so as to achieve this noble aim by united action.

The conviction is growing not only in world public opinion, but also in government and parliamentary circles in many countries, that the speediest solution of the question of ending atomic and hydrogen weapon tests is essential. Resolutions demanding the conclusion of an agreement on the ending of nuclear tests have been adopted by the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., and also by the parliaments of India, Japan, Yugoslavia, Indonesia, Burma and other countries.

Some of the most eminent scientists of the world point out the serious danger hanging over mankind in view of the continuation of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests. Recently many hundreds and thousands of eminent scientists in the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain, France, Germany, Japan and many other countries have made statements about the need to end nuclear tests immediately.

The Soviet government fully shares the opinion of the governments and parliaments of various countries, of broad public opinion, and scientists, that atomic and hydrogen weapon tests must be ended immediately. For several years now the Soviet government has been insisting in the United Nations organisations on the urgent implementation of this step.

The need for the immediate ending of atomic weapons tests is dictated first of all by the fact that the realisation of such a measure would provide an effective barrier to the further perfecting of atomic weapons and the creation of new and still more destructive types of these weapons, and would be a first step on the way to the main objective—the total prohibition of atomic weapons. For it is perfectly obvious that tests of nuclear weapons are being carried out to verify the effectiveness of their destructive properties, with a view to making these weapons a still more terrible means for the mass annihilation of mankind. There is no escaping the fact that each experimental explosion of an atomic or hydrogen bomb carried out by one country urges on the others to carry out similar measures, to avoid "lagging behind." And this in the long run leads to the general intensification of the nuclear armaments race and makes the situation in the world more tense and dangerous.

Of great significance, too, is the fact that agreement between

the great powers on this question would have a beneficial influence on the entire international situation and would help to strengthen confidence among the states.

It is also necessary to take into consideration the fact that the radiation caused as a result of nuclear explosions is already a danger to the life and health of mankind. The ending of atomic tests would remove the harmful consequences of nuclear explosions.

The Soviet Union has proposed that the question of ending nuclear tests be separated from the general disarmament problem and that it be solved immediately and independently, without making it contingent on agreement being reached on other disarmament issues.

The advantages and practicability of such a proposal are obvious. In the first place, atomic and hydrogen weapons are being produced and tested at present by only three states—the United States, the U.S.S.R. and Britain, and consequently agreement depends only on the goodwill of these three powers. Since the Soviet Union has expressed readiness to agree to the immediate ending of tests, the matter rests with the other two powers—the United States and Britain.

Secondly, agreement on ending tests is a simple step, not entailing any complicated organisational measures, for at the present level of science, supervision over the ending of tests does not call for the establishment of a cumbersome system of control, and is a completely feasible task.

The Soviet Union calls for the unconditional prohibition of nuclear weapon tests. However, since the western powers display no readiness to take the step, in the interests of reaching a mutually acceptable agreement, the Soviet government has proposed the suspension of nuclear tests, if only temporarily, for a period of 2 to 3 years. Taking into account the western powers' wish, the Soviet Union also proposed the establishment on a reciprocal basis of control posts on the territory of the U.S.S.R., the United States and Britain, and in the Pacific area, to supervise the carrying out of the agreement on ending tests.

One would think that such a measure, the advantage of which for the whole of mankind is obvious, could not arouse objections. However, to this day it has been impossible to reach agreement with the western powers on the ending, or at least temporary suspension for 2 or 3 years, of nuclear weapon tests.

Until very recently they did not even try to conceal their negative attitude to this proposal.

In the face of the unanimous demand of the peoples that dangerous experiments with weapons of mass destruction be ended, the United States and the other western powers which are members of the Sub-Committee have now adopted a different tactic, evidence of which is the statement by the United States representative, made in the Sub-Committee on August 21. While not rejecting formally the proposal for the suspension of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests, the United States at the same time nullifies the possibility of reaching agreement on this, by artificially linking the realisation of this proposal with other disarmament measures, agreement on which encounters considerable difficulties, again caused by the position of the western powers themselves. In particular, they say they will not agree to a temporary suspension of nuclear weapon tests until agreement is reached on ending the production of fissile material for military purposes. But even with these conditions the United States agrees to talk about suspending tests for a period of only 12 months, i.e., for a period no greater than is required for preparations for further tests. Although the United States statement on August 21 mentions an additional period of 12 months for the ending of tests, the possibility of reaching agreement on this period—in view of the conditions laid down for it—is even more doubtful than in the case of the first period.

To what does the United States proposal to end production of fissile material for military purposes—which is put forward as an absolute condition for United States' agreement to suspend nuclear tests—really amount?

In one of his recent statements the United States Secretary of State said that it is impossible for the United States, without risk, to renounce the utilisation of existing stocks of fissile material for the production of weapons. This same line is also fully reflected in the recent proposals of the western powers, which not only provide for the states retaining at their disposal the stockpiles of nuclear weapons already made, but also for continuation of the production of such weapons from existing stocks of fissile material, while at the same time the western powers categorically object to the prohibition of nuclear weapons.

The question arises—what is the point of the American proposal to end the production of fissile material for military

purposes, when even after it is adopted production of atomic and hydrogen bombs will continue in the United States as before, and the atomic weapon will continue unprohibited? All these facts indicate that both the United States and Britain really do not intend to end the production of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

Sometimes statements are made to the effect that the object of the proposal that the production of fissile material for military purposes be stopped is to prevent the spreading of atomic weapons "throughout the world." The actions of the United States, however, point to exactly the opposite. It is common knowledge that the United States government, while advocating in words that the atomic weapon be prevented from spreading, at the same time is working out, and not only working out but even implementing, plans to put atomic weapons at the disposal of its N.A.T.O. partners which, naturally, leads to intensification of international tension and makes the solution of the disarmament problem still more difficult.

As far as ending the production of fissile material for military purposes is concerned, it will only be of real importance for removing the threat of atomic war when it is linked inseparably with their withdrawal from the armaments of the states and the destruction of stockpiles of these weapons. And it is precisely such a solution of the question that the Soviet Union calls for.

The western powers' linking of the question of ending nuclear weapon tests with the question of ending the production of fissile material for military purposes shows that they are very far indeed from desiring to help put an end to nuclear weapon tests. This can only retard the solution of such an urgent problem as that of prohibiting nuclear tests.

To this should be added the fact that the United States and its partners are making the ending of nuclear weapon tests contingent on a reduction in conventional armaments and armed forces, which is obviously directed at evading at present a solution to the question of ending nuclear weapon tests, since it is the western powers themselves who are hampering the reaching of agreement on this question.

The fact is also noteworthy that recently certain circles of the western powers have begun to spread the fabrication about so-called "clean" nuclear weapons, for the creation of which, they assert, it is necessary to continue tests. Beyond doubt the tale

about "clean" nuclear weapons which they have set going was needed in order somehow or other to "justify" their objections to the ending of atomic and hydrogen bomb tests, and has as its object to continue to hamper the reaching of agreement on this question. It is easy to see that this is the latest attempt deliberately to confuse the simple and clear-cut question of ending nuclear weapon tests—a question that has long been ripe for solution.

The discussion of the United Nations Sub-Committee of the question of ending nuclear weapon tests shows that responsibility for the continuing experimental explosions of atomic and hydrogen bombs fall entirely on the governments of the western powers, and first and foremost on the United States and Great Britain.

### *The States Must Renounce the Use of Atomic and Hydrogen Weapons*

IN the period between the two world wars, public opinion, as we know, unanimously condemned chemical and bacteriological weapons and their use was prohibited by appropriate international conventions. This prohibition played a positive role. Whereas during the First World War the chemical weapon, as we know, was used, in the Second World War the belligerent parties did not resort to chemical and bacteriological means of warfare. Today, however, there has appeared a weapon of mass destruction many times more terrible in action—the nuclear weapon—for which the target is not only military objectives but primarily big cities, centres of industry and culture created by centuries of work and the creative genius of the peoples.

It is therefore understandable that from the very day that the first American atom bombs were dropped on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, taking a toll of many thousands of civilian citizens whose charred bodies were buried under the ruins of the houses, the peoples have been demanding more and more insistently the prohibition of nuclear weapons. The government cannot ignore this demand of the peoples. It is the noble duty of the states to undertake not to permit the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

Unwilling to agree to the prohibition of nuclear weapons, the leaders of the western powers, in justification of their position, are fond of pleading that the existence of the nuclear weapon in

the hands of the states has, so they allege, a deterring effect and lessens the possibility of the outbreak of atomic war.

This is a patent deception. On the contrary, history teaches us that the armaments race has always resulted in its logical end, in war. The course of events that preceded the First and Second World Wars is convincing confirmation of this. What guarantee is there that the present armaments race, in particular in the field of atomic weapons, will not lead to the unleashing of military conflicts or to a new world war with the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons? There is no such guarantee.

The governments of the western powers attempt to present matters in such a way as though the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons is legitimate and as though there can be no talk about renouncing their use, but only about determining the conditions and circumstances for the use of such weapons. In particular, it is proposed to recognise the use of nuclear weapons as legitimate in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, which speaks of the right of states to self-defence in the event of attack. It is not difficult to understand, however, that the adoption of such a formula would not only fail to result in the prohibition of nuclear weapons but would in fact signify the legalisation of the use of these weapons. Such a formulation leaves a loophole which may give the aggressor the possibility of officially resorting, on the pretext of the right to self-defence, to the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons. Do we not know from history that aggressors continually have recourse to references of self-defence? Hitler, too, when he attacked other countries, shouted about "self-defence."

It is not difficult to see that this position of the western powers is fundamentally contrary to the interests of the peoples, who long to be freed from the danger of atomic war, for the unconditional prohibition and withdrawal of nuclear weapons from the armaments of the states. The assumption of a voluntary obligation by the states possessing this weapon to renounce its use could be an important step towards achieving this object.

An agreement on the renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons would be of exceptionally great importance for peace and the relaxation of international tension. Such an agreement would create an atmosphere of moral and political condemnation of the barbaric atomic weapon and, to a considerable degree, would help to establish confidence in relations between



the states. At the same time it would be a serious step towards the total prohibition of atomic weapons and would show the peoples of the world clearly that the powers possessing nuclear weapons had gone from words to deeds and were taking real steps to free mankind from the danger of atomic war.

### *The Soviet Union Favours a Substantial Reduction in Armed Forces, Armaments and Military Expenditures*

IT is twelve years since the Second World War ended, but the armed forces of the main western powers have still not been reduced to levels appropriate to peacetime conditions, but continue to be stationed on foreign territories as though the war had not yet ended.

Facts testify that the United States, Great Britain and France are not endeavouring to put an end to such an abnormal situation, but are conducting preparations for a new war.

No more than four years after the end of the Second World War, on the initiative of the United States government and with the support of the governments of Britain and France, a military grouping of powers was set up directed against the Soviet Union and certain other states who had been allies of the United States, Britain and France in the fight against Hitler aggression. The construction of United States air and naval bases on foreign territories, set up as close as possible to the frontiers of the Soviet Union and countries friendly to it, have been assuming an ever-wider scale in recent years. As we know, between 1951 and 1957 the number of N.A.T.O. air bases in Europe alone increased from 15 to 150. In the N.A.T.O. countries measures are being feverishly carried out to equip all the services with atomic and hydrogen weapons and rocket equipment. The military budgets of many countries, exceeding the normal peace-time level by dozens of times, swallow up an ever-increasing share of the useful labour of the population. In this connection the following facts are noteworthy: In 1956 the total strength of the armed forces of the N.A.T.O. member-countries reached 6,000,000-7,000,000 men, and the aggregate military expenditures of the members of this bloc in 1957 will amount to no less than 58,000-60,000 million dollars. In the United States alone expenditures have been approved for military purposes in 1957-58 amounting to 43,300 million dollars, or 63 per cent. of budget expenditures. However, even this rate and this scale does not

satisfy the supporters of the armaments race. They complain that this rate is insufficiently high.

For what purpose is all this being done? Do all these military preparations lead to the safeguarding of the peace and security of any given power or powers? The answer can only be in the negative. On the contrary, such measures as the preparations being made by the aggressive North Atlantic bloc for atomic war in Europe and the establishment of a wide network of American military bases on foreign territories subject the security of many states to a tremendous risk—particularly those on whose territories these preparations are being carried out—not to mention that the sharpening of international relations caused by these preparations is in itself fraught with the danger of war.

It may be said that even the Soviet Union is arming and spending not inconsiderable amounts for defence purposes. This, of course, is so. But it goes without saying that the U.S.S.R., and also the other peace-loving states, cannot disregard the fact that a ring of United States military bases, called N.A.T.O. bases, has been set up around the Soviet Union, that the military preparations of the United States and its N.A.T.O. allies, as has been stated more than once by the representatives of this aggressive military grouping's command itself, are aimed directly against the Soviet Union and the other socialist states. In this connection one may recall the repeated statements by the present Commander-in-Chief of the N.A.T.O. armed forces, the American General Norstad, the West German Minister of Defence Strauss, and other N.A.T.O. military leaders, who do not conceal their plans for attack on the Soviet Union. Not in the least disconcerted, they laud to the skies the advantages of their bases for striking the first blows against the Soviet Union.

It is natural that the Soviet government cannot overlook the fact that the western powers, continuing to avoid the conclusion of a disarmament agreement, are at the same time, pursuing a frantic armaments race, preparing for a new war. All this confronts the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist camp with the need to take appropriate measures to ensure their security, in order to be ready to repulse any aggression and to restrain the aggressor.

Desiring to put an end to the arms race, the Soviet government, on March 18 and April 30, submitted to the governments of the western powers taking part in the work of the United Nations Disarmament Sub-Committee entirely concrete proposals for the reduction of the armed forces, armaments and military

budgets of the United States, the U.S.S.R., Britain and France.

The fulfilment, at least initially, of even partial measures for disarmament would undoubtedly help to improve the situation in Europe and throughout the world and create an atmosphere of confidence in relations between states, which would make it possible to advance towards further disarmament.

The western powers have taken a negative attitude to the Soviet proposals and on various far-fetched pretexts are evading the conclusion of an agreement to carry out a real reduction in armed forces and armaments. Thus, in place of the previously suggested level for the armed forces of the United States and the U.S.S.R., of 1,000,000-1,500,000 men, they have now put forward the proposal that the armed forces of the U.S.S.R. and the United States be reduced in three stages, to the levels of 2,500,000, 2,100,000 and 1,700,000 men respectively. Moreover, the reduction in armed forces below the level of 2,500,000 men is made conditional on the preliminary settlement of outstanding international problems.

The governments of the United States, Britain and France, and also the Federal Republic of Germany, in a joint declaration on July 29, confirmed that they regard the preliminary settlement of the question of German reunification as a prerequisite for a disarmament agreement. Linking the question of disarmament with German reunification—particularly in view of the blackmailing policy of the militarist circles of Western Germany, who demand as the price for the Federal Republic of Germany's agreement to disarmament the reunification of Germany on Adenauer's terms—erects fresh serious obstacles in the way of solving the problem of disarmament, and also of solving the German problem itself. But this, apparently, is what the western powers want.

The Soviet Union's proposal for a 15 per cent. cut in military budgets did not meet with a positive response on the part of the western powers, who limited themselves to general statements on the question and refuse to assume any concrete undertakings.

The western powers also evade discussion of the Soviet Union's proposal regarding the closing down of military bases and the withdrawal of troops from the territory of foreign states.

Experience shows therefore that any concrete proposals directed at reducing the arms race encounter resistance from the governments of the United States, Britain and the other western powers.

The governments of the western powers push into the fore-

ground questions of control, trying to substitute discussion on these questions for discussion of the main subject of the talks, i.e., actual measures for disarmament. The Soviet government has also exerted considerable effort to bring closer the positions of the participants in the talks on the question of international control over disarmament. On April 30 it submitted a proposal for stationing on the territories of the appropriate states, on a reciprocal basis, beginning with the first stage of disarmament, control posts at big ports, railway junctions and highways, with the task of ensuring that no dangerous concentration of armed forces and armaments takes place. The Soviet Union proposed that such control posts be stationed in definite zones on the territory of the U.S.S.R., the United States, Britain and France, and also on the territory of other member-countries both of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation and of the Warsaw Treaty.

For a considerable period now the governments of the western powers have been making the reaching of agreement on disarmament questions contingent on the adoption of their plan for aerial inspection with the help of aerial photography.

The question of aerial photography is not a new one. It has been raised previously—as long ago as July, 1955, at the four-power heads of government conference in Geneva, when United States President Eisenhower came out with the proposal for flying over the territory of the Soviet Union and the United States. The representatives of the Soviet Union expressed their attitude to this proposal at the time. It was pointed out that aerial photography in itself solved neither the problem of control of disarmament nor the problem of preventing aggression and sudden attack, and that the task was not that of engaging in the photographing of extensive areas but of making a start with practical measures for the reduction of armed forces and armaments and for preventing the danger of war.

However, taking into consideration the fact that the United States and its partners are making the question of aerial photography a condition for the conclusion of a disarmament agreement, and endeavouring to meet these powers, the Soviet government agreed to the use of aerial photography and indicated definite areas in which aerial inspection should be carried out.

In its proposals of April 30 last, submitted for the Disarmament Sub-Committee's consideration, the Soviet government favoured, in particular, the establishment of an aerial photo-

graphy zone in the centre of Europe, where the main armed forces of the opposing military groupings are stationed, since this area holds the greatest threat to peace and the security of the states, and also a zone in the Far East. In submitting these proposals the Soviet government thought that the United States would meet it, as a result of which favourable conditions would be created for achieving a mutually acceptable agreement on partial disarmament.

The United States and the other western powers, however, did not support these Soviet proposals, thereby showing no desire to help work out an agreement on disarmament.

Instead, the United States, France, Great Britain and Canada on August 2 submitted fresh proposals for aerial photography, providing for the whole of the territory of the United States, Canada and the Soviet Union to be covered.

What are the objects pursued by the United States at present in putting forward new proposals for aerial photography? The statesmen of the United States and N.A.T.O. leaders do not conceal, but openly proclaim, that they are preparing for atomic war against the peace-loving states, that they are preparing to bomb from the air the territories of these states, their chief industrial and political centres, communication centres etc. It is clear from the pronouncements of United States statesmen and military leaders that the military leadership of the United States and N.A.T.O. would like, by means of aerial photography, to obtain the most complete information possible on the siting of the Soviet Union's main industrial centres and communication centres. It is obvious that this proposal of the United States has as its object the collection of intelligence information; it leads not to an improvement but to a deterioration in the international situation and objectively is directed at serving the purpose of preparations for aggressive war and not the removal of the danger of war.

It is most characteristic that the western powers' proposals do not provide for aerial photography being carried out on the territory of a number of countries in which the military bases of the member-countries of the aggressive N.A.T.O. military grouping are situated. The exclusion from aerial inspection of countries in which, though not N.A.T.O. members, there are foreign military bases, would place the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Treaty allies whose territory it is proposed to open to aerial inspection, in an unequal position.

As for the other American proposal, to carry out aerial

photography of Arctic areas, this proposal can hardly be regarded seriously, since flying over the empty, sparsely populated expanses of the Arctic can yield nothing useful, either for disarmament or the prevention of sudden attack by one country or another.

The fact that the western powers have submitted such unreal proposals for the Sub-Committee's consideration indicates that the United States and the other western powers do not want the conclusion of a disarmament agreement, though they attempt to present themselves as supporters of disarmament.

It is justly pointed out that in the circumstances in which there is a deep chasm of mistrust and suspicion between the great powers, in the conditions of strained international relations, in the conditions of the armaments race and preparations for atomic war being conducted by the N.A.T.O. countries, no peace-loving state could consent to the whole of its territory being flown over, without placing in danger the vital interests of the security of its state.

In such circumstances it is impossible to regard the western powers' proposal to fly over the whole territory of the United States, Canada and the Soviet Union other than as a manoeuvre aimed at distracting attention from the urgent problems of disarmament and achieving complete freedom of action for their military air intelligence in the interests of preparations for aggression.

The Soviet government, in respect of the August 2 proposal of the United States, Great Britain, France and Canada for aerial photography, once more emphasises that no inspection can shift discussion of the disarmament problem from the state of deadlock. No aerial photography is capable of preventing sudden attack by an aggressor if he has at his disposal the weapon for a mass blow, combined with modern means of delivering it to its target, and armies many millions strong. The solution must be sought elsewhere.

The Soviet government is of the opinion that at the present time attention should be paid to carrying out such measures as would help to reduce international tension, promote co-operation between the states, the expansion of economic and cultural relations, the abolition of trade discrimination. No small part could be played in improving relations between countries by prohibiting war propaganda, particularly propaganda for the use of atomic or hydrogen weapons against given states. The resolution prohibiting war propaganda, adopted by the United

Nations General Assembly in 1947, is not being carried out. Only the Soviet Union and a few other countries have adopted laws against war propaganda. The absence of laws against war propaganda in other countries creates favourable soil for the fanning of militarist tendencies, enmity and hatred between the peoples. In the interests of easing international tension and reducing the danger of war, the appropriate steps should be taken to put an end to war propaganda.

Of the greatest importance for easing international tension and creating an atmosphere of confidence between the states would be the prohibition of nuclear weapons, a substantial reduction in the armed forces and armaments of the states and the liquidation of foreign military bases on the territories of other countries.

If these measures were carried out the present tension and mistrust in relations between the powers would give way to friendly co-operation in trade, economics, culture and science. There would then be no obstacle to the utmost widening of contacts, to the exchange of experience between states and peoples. In these circumstances the obstacles to carrying out reciprocal aerial photography of the whole of the territory of the U.S.S.R., the United States and other countries belonging to N.A.T.O., S.E.A.T.O., the Bagdad Pact and the Warsaw Treaty would automatically disappear.

#### *The Disarmament Sub-Committee is Not Coping with its Task*

AS a result of the negative attitude taken by the representatives of the United States, Great Britain, France and Canada, the Sub-Committee has been unable to adopt agreed decisions on the disarmament questions discussed. Such urgent questions as those of the immediate ending of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests, of the assumption by the states of an obligation to renounce the use of these weapons, of a substantial reduction in the armed forces of the states, have remained, as before, unsolved.

What then is the reason why the Disarmament Sub-Committee has still not fulfilled the task set it—to stop the armaments race and remove the danger of a new war?

The reason for this situation is first and foremost that on the Sub-Committee, apart from the Soviet Union, there are countries whose ruling circles are not interested in disarmament. As is known, of the five members of the Sub-Committee, the four capitalist countries—the United States, Britain, France and

Canada—occupy the leading position in the aggressive North Atlantic bloc.

Thus the western powers have in actual fact placed disarmament in the hands of N.A.T.O., which is the organisation of their military alliance. This fact arouses particular anxiety for the prospects of the disarmament talks. As is known, the N.A.T.O. leaders base all their calculations on the use of the atomic weapon, on the continuation of the armaments race, on preparations for a new war, and to place the question of disarmament in the hands of these people reflects the desire of the ruling circles of the powers belonging to the North Atlantic military alliance to doom disarmament to failure.

The United States and the other western powers represented on the Sub-Committee are entering into collusion beforehand with the other members of N.A.T.O., including the Adenauer government, which is carrying out the militarisation of the Federal Republic of Germany. At the same time the western powers refuse in the United Nations Sub-Committee to listen to the views of countries which do not belong to blocs and show sincere concern for strengthening peace—as happened, for instance, when India asked that her opinion be heard in the Sub-Committee.

This position taken up by the western powers not only betrays their fear of a wide discussion of this important problem with the participation of countries that do not belong to their closed military groupings, but is directly contrary to the resolution of the Eleventh Session of the General Assembly, which instructed the Sub-Committee to examine and take into account proposals submitted to the United Nations by other states on questions of disarmament.

Though the reaching of agreement on disarmament depends first and foremost on those great powers who possess the largest armed forces and have at their disposal atomic and hydrogen weapons, all the peoples of the world, large and small, are equally interested in the solution of the disarmament problem. For the successful solution of disarmament issues it is necessary to take into account not only the proposals of the five states represented on the Sub-Committee, but also the considerations of other United Nations member-states, especially those who come out actively against the armaments race, against the use of nuclear weapons and for ending the tests. The inclusion of a greater number of states, representing different continents and different

social systems, in the discussion of disarmament problems in the United Nations organs, would make it possible to impart to this discussion a more objective character and to hear the voice of other governments and peoples which, unfortunately, is not being done in the United Nations Sub-Committee with its present narrow and one-sided composition. It is no longer possible to accept the totally abnormal situation in which not only a number of big states interested in solving the problem of disarmament are barred from its work, but in which entire continents are not represented on it—Asia, Africa, Latin America.

Furthermore, the western powers have imposed in the Sub-Committee a secret, private method of work. This results in public opinion being kept in ignorance, and frequently simply misled, regarding the true state of affairs in the Sub-Committee. Such a method, to all appearances, suits the ruling circles of the western powers. It enables them, by pleading secrecy of the Sub-Committee's work, to avoid giving direct answers to questions asked in parliaments and in the press as to the progress of the talks, and to present matters in such a way as though serious talks are going on there whereas in actual fact the talks are not making any progress at all. The question arises: What need have the United States and its partners for the talks in the Sub-Committee? The whole of the aforesaid leaves no doubt that the United States and the other western powers want to use the Sub-Committee in order to mislead public opinion, to instil false illusions, deceive the peoples, who are vitally interested in ending this armaments race and removing the danger of a new war with the use of nuclear weapons.

But in the days when professional politicians and diplomats were able to decide in secrecy from the peoples, behind their backs, issues that affected the fundamental, vital interests of the peoples, have gone never to return. The terrible sufferings and disasters of the Second World War still live in the memories of the peoples, and they know what a third world war may bring them in our age of atomic and rocket engineering. They demand from the governments a clear and unambiguous answer to the question: Do they favour the continuation of the armaments race or disarmament, the prohibition of atomic weapons or preparations for atomic war? And not a single government can get out of answering the question.

In all countries the peoples are day by day taking an increas-

ingly active part in political life, and they are waging an insistent struggle against a situation in which the interests of a small handful of millionaires and billionaires, making enormous profits from war orders, have a decisive influence on the position of the western powers on the questions of disarmament and prevent the settlement of the disarmament problem. The peoples will not allow the forces of war to triumph over the forces of peace and progress.

### *Agreement on Disarmament Can and Must Be Reached*

THERE are real possibilities at the present time for reaching agreement on certain most urgent measures for disarmament and the prevention of the threat of atomic war. The important thing is not to miss these opportunities.

The Soviet Government has submitted to the United Nations proposals concerning both atomic weapons and conventional armaments, concerning an all-embracing disarmament programme and partial measures. The main task of the states that bear primary responsibility for the settlement of the disarmament problem is to show the necessary desire and good will to reach agreement on questions of disarmament and to get down to a businesslike discussion of the disarmament proposals which the United Nations Disarmament Sub-Committee has before it for consideration. Only such an approach to this question can yield the practical results which all who cherish the interests of peace and the security of the peoples expect from the United Nations.

The Soviet government is of the opinion that the interests of ensuring lasting world peace and the interests of the security of all states would be best served by the implementation of a broad programme of disarmament. If the western powers, however, are not prepared to agree to the adoption of broad disarmament measures, the Soviet Union is prepared to agree to the implementation of partial measures. In this the Soviet government proceeds from the view that to achieve mutual confidence and get rid of the suspicion and fear that characterise present-day relations between states, the initial practical steps, which can be undertaken without any risk to them, are of particular importance.

Being of the opinion that it is necessary to proceed, at last, from words to deeds and make a beginning with practical steps in the field of disarmament, the government of the Union of

Soviet Socialist Republics once more calls upon the governments of the United States, Great Britain, France and Canada with the proposal that, pending the reaching of agreement on other disarmament questions, agreement be reached without delay on the urgent primary measures of disarmament.

The Soviet government, taking into account the insistent demands of the peoples, proposes in the first place that agreement be reached on the immediate and unconditional prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests or on the temporary suspension of such tests for 2 or 3 years, with the establishment of appropriate control, without this measure being made contingent on the realisation of other steps in the field of disarmament.

The Soviet government likewise proposes that agreement be reached on carrying out partial disarmament measures, providing for the renunciation by the states of the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons; the reduction of the armed forces of the states to definite levels; the reduction of the armaments and military budgets of the states; elimination of foreign military bases on the territory of other countries; reduction of the armed forces of the United States, the U.S.S.R., Britain and France in Germany; the establishment of international control over the implementation of disarmament measures.

The Soviet government submitted corresponding proposals on disarmament questions for the consideration of the United Nations Disarmament Sub-Committee on March 18, April 30, and June 14, 1957.

The problem of disarmament awaits solution. It is necessary to go over from fruitless discussions to deeds. It is important to take the first step in disarmament with a view to clearing the road for the gradual solution of this problem as a whole, which, given good will, can undoubtedly be solved. This object would be greatly facilitated by open discussion of disarmament questions in the United Nations with the participation not only of five countries, but also of the other states who are vitally interested in the solution of the disarmament problem.

As far as the Soviet government is concerned, it will continue in the future to exert every effort for the speediest solution of this most important problem of the day.

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

# DISARMAMENT

## Soviet Government Statement

August 27, 1957

"Soviet News"

Booklet No. 14

3<sup>D</sup>.

489