

Other Booklets Available include:

THE SOVIET UNION ON DISARMAMENT, May 14, 1956. 2d.
ON OVERCOMING THE CULT OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND
ITS CONSEQUENCES. June 1956. 4d.
THE SIXTH FIVE-YEAR PLAN. Directives and Report. 6d.
100 QUESTIONS ON THE U.S.S.R. 1s. 6d.
N. S. KHRUSHCHOV. Report on Twentieth Congress of the
C.P.S.U. 4d.
DOCUMENTS ON HUNGARY (Two Parts). Nos. 24 and 26.
4d. each.
CONSTITUTION OF THE U.S.S.R. 6d.
THE U.S.S.R.—A REFERENCE BOOK. 2s.
PEACE AND DISARMAMENT—Soviet Proposals 1956-7. 3d.
MIDDLE EAST—Soviet Proposals. 3d.
EUROPEAN SECURITY—Soviet Proposals. 3d.
THE NATIONS CAN LIVE IN PEACE, The Soviet View. 3d.
THE SOVIET UNION IN 1960. Story of the Sixth Five-Year
Plan 6d.
SOVIET SPORTS HANDBOOK. 9d.
RADIANT CHILDHOOD. 4d.
MOSCOW UNIVERSITY. Price 6d.
FIRST IN THE WORLD (Atomic Electricity Station). 3d.
ATOMS FOR PEACE. 6d.
SOVIET PENSIONS. 6d.
TRAINING TECHNICIANS IN THE SOVIET UNION. 6d.
SOVIET FOOTBALL. Illustrated. 6d.
PLANNING IN THE SOVIET UNION. 6d.
SOVIET INDUSTRY AND FOREIGN TRADE. 6d.
40th ANNIVERSARY. N. S. Khrushchov Report. 4d.
N. S. KHRUSHCHOV. Interviews with American Journalists. 4d.
N. A. BULGANIN. Messages to Britain, U.S.A., France, and
Germany, etc. 4d.

For developments within the Soviet Union, one should read SOVIET
WEEKLY, illustrated, every Thursday, Price 3d., from most
newsagents or direct from SOVIET WEEKLY, 3 Rosary Gardens,
London, S.W.7

Published by Soviet News, 3 Rosary Gardens, London, S.W.7, and printed by
March Publicity Press Ltd. (T.U. all departments), London, S.E.1.

Ninth Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet

SOVIET PROPOSALS FOR STRENGTHENING PEACE

Supreme Soviet's Resolution
on Foreign Policy



Statement by Foreign Minister
A. A. Gromyko



Speech by N. S. Khrushchov
on the International Situation



December 21st 1957

Soviet News
Booklet No. 22

4^D

491

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

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

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



SOVIET PROPOSALS FOR STRENGTHENING PEACE

Foreign Minister A. A. Gromyko and N. S. Khrushchov addressed the ninth session of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet on December 21. Speaking at a joint sitting of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities—the closing meeting of the session—Gromyko replied to an interpellation by a group of Deputies concerning the results of the disarmament talks and the prospects for agreement on this subject, and Khrushchov made an important speech on the international situation. The Supreme Soviet unanimously passed the following resolution approving the Soviet government's foreign policy :

Supreme Soviet's Resolution

THE Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. fully approves the foreign policy of the Soviet government.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. entirely supports the proposals set forth in the messages and Notes of the U.S.S.R. government to the governments of the member-countries of the United Nations Organisation, as being in keeping with the aim of easing international tension and ending the "cold war" and the arms race, the aim of extending peaceful co-operation among all states.

Expressing the firm will and unanimous desire of the Soviet people for peace, the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet believes that at the present time, when the arms race—in particular in atomic and hydrogen weapons—is still continuing, it is imperative to adopt measures to prevent events from taking a dangerous course, to safeguard peace and free humanity from the threat of an atomic war of annihilation.

This task could be achieved by:

1. A pledge by the powers possessing atomic and hydrogen weapons—the U.S.S.R., the United States and the United Kingdom—not to use these weapons ;

2. A pledge by the U.S.S.R., the United States, and the United Kingdom to cease, as from January 1, 1958, all tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons ;

3. An agreement between the U.S.S.R., the United States, and the United Kingdom not to deploy nuclear weapons of any kind on the territory of either Western or Eastern Germany, and acceptance of the proposal of Poland, Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic renouncing the manufacture and deployment of nuclear weapons on the territories of these countries and Western Germany.

4. A substantial reduction of the strength of the armed forces and armaments of states, and in the first place of the great powers, which possess the most powerful armed forces;

5. A non - aggression agreement between the member-countries of the North Atlantic Alliance and the member-countries of the Warsaw Treaty;

6. An agreement to refrain from any steps infringing upon the independence of the countries of the Middle East, and renunciation of the use of force in solving problems involving this area;

7. The cessation of war propaganda in those countries where such propaganda is still being conducted, and the all-round development of international trade, science and cultural relations among states.

The U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet is convinced that a personal meeting between the leaders of states and the discussion

CONTENTS

Resolution of U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet	Page 3
Statement by Foreign Minister A. A. Gromyko on Soviet Government's Foreign Policy	6
Speech by N. S. Khrushchov to U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet	13

by them of urgent international problems would be conducive to finding ways to ease the existing tension in the relations among states and to promote mutual confidence among them.

The U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet notes with deep satisfaction that the peaceful initiative of the Soviet Union is meeting with understanding and support among the broadest international circles who see, in our times, only one way of avoiding atomic war—the way of peaceful co-existence. There is growing recognition of the fact that in the situation prevailing in the world, when there are capitalist and socialist states, any attempts to change this situation by external force, attempts at interference in the domestic affairs of other states for the purpose of changing their political systems, attempts to impose any territorial changes and violate the present *status quo*, would have disastrous consequences for the cause of world peace.

The U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet notes with satisfaction that, having considered the question of the peaceful co-existence of states, the recent session of the United Nations General Assembly came out in support of the principle of peaceful co-existence and adopted a resolution which recognises the need to develop relations among states “on a basis of mutual respect and profit, non-aggression, mutual respect for sovereignty, equality, territorial integrity, and non-interference in one another’s domestic affairs.” The Assembly made an appeal to all states “to use every effort in strengthening international peace and developing friendly relations and co-operation, and in the solution of disputes by peaceful means.”

The adoption of such a resolution by the United Nations reflects the tremendous growth throughout the world of demands to stop the arms drive, to find ways and means for the peaceful settlement of disputed questions, to stop the dangerous development of events in the direction of a new war and not allow war to break out. The Supreme Soviet points out that these sentiments were reflected also in the speeches of a number of statesmen of member-countries

of the North Atlantic Alliance at the N.A.T.O. Council session in Paris, who expressed themselves in favour of accepting the Soviet government’s proposal to conduct negotiations among the powers. However, although the decisions of the N.A.T.O. Council session do mention the expediency of negotiations with the Soviet Union on disarmament questions, those decisions are as a whole directed towards continuing the military preparations of the member-states of the North Atlantic Alliance, and indicate the intention of N.A.T.O.’s leading powers to continue a policy dangerous to peace.

Guided by the noble aims of strengthening universal peace, the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet expresses the hope that the Parliaments and the governments of all countries will give due consideration to the proposals put forward by the Soviet Union and do all they can to ease international tension and refrain from steps that might lead to complications in the relations among states.

The U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet takes note of the declarations made by leading statesmen of member-countries of the North Atlantic Alliance, to the effect that these states take the stand of not using force in relations with other countries. This shows that a sober approach to the solution of international problems is making increasing headway. Taking these statements into consideration and hoping that they will be reflected in practical steps by the N.A.T.O. member-states, and striving to make a new and major contribution to the cause of strengthening peace and establishing an atmosphere of confidence among peoples, the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet authorises the Soviet government to examine the question of further reducing the armed forces of the Soviet Union, and to maintain at a proper level—pending an international disarmament agreement—the remaining strength of the armed forces and armaments in order fully to ensure the defence interests of the Soviet Union.

The U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet hopes that the United States, the United Kingdom and France will, for their part,

take steps to reduce their armed forces and thus contribute to the cause of establishing genuine international security.

The U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet expresses confidence that the efforts of the peoples of the Soviet Union, People’s China and the other socialist states, combined with the efforts of all the other peoples defending the noble cause of peace and

friendship among all nations, will be crowned with success and that mankind, rid of the danger of a new war, may entirely devote all its efforts to peaceful labour.

**Supreme Soviet of the Union of
Soviet Socialist Republics**

Kremlin, Moscow. December 21, 1957

STATEMENT BY A. A. GROMYKO

THE Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. has instructed me to reply to the interpellation by a group of Deputies concerning the results of the discussion among the states on the disarmament problem and the possibility of reaching agreement on this question.

The Soviet government is seriously concerned that notwithstanding all the efforts of the Soviet Union and the other peace-loving states that are striving to end the arms race and to avert the threat of another war, the disarmament problem has not been solved.

You know that the 10-year discussions on the disarmament problem in the United Nations bodies did not produce agreement and have now been suspended. The reason for this state of affairs is that our principal partners in the disarmament talks, the United States, the United Kingdom, and also France, acting in line with them, do not want, as the facts have shown, to bind themselves by any commitments with regard to the restriction of armaments and measures to prevent the stockpiling and improvement of nuclear weapons. Let us look at the facts.

While sterile discussions on disarmament were held both in the Sub-Committee and the United Nations Disarmament Commission, and periodically at the sessions of the General Assembly, the governments of the United States and Britain, and also France, actually pursued aims quite the opposite of those of disarmament.

At the conference table the United States and the United Kingdom pretend to be striving for agreement on disarmament, whereas in actual fact they are doing their utmost to stockpile armaments and demand of their N.A.T.O. partners that more and more divisions be placed at the disposal of the N.A.T.O. command and that the enormous expenditures on armaments be further increased. The United States, supported by the United Kingdom and certain other member-states of the N.A.T.O.

military bloc, is encouraging in every way the arming of Western Germany in order to place her economic and manpower resources at the service of the N.A.T.O. war plans.

The Soviet government, guided by the Leninist principles of the Soviet Union's foreign policy, has tabled in the United Nations many proposals aimed at a practical solution of the disarmament problem. You know that it has proposed the complete prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, their removal from national armaments, an end to the manufacture of these weapons and the destruction of existing stocks. The Soviet proposals also provide for a substantial reduction of armed forces, armaments and military budgets.

The Soviet government made a thorough study of the proposals of the western powers in order to find points of contiguity, to single out what is acceptable both to them and to us. In a number of instances the Soviet Union accepted the proposals of the western powers. This was the case, for instance, with regard to the establishment of ceilings for the armed forces of the great powers. But all this did not lead anywhere. No sooner had the Soviet Union accepted the proposals of the western powers than they immediately created fresh obstacles by going back on their own words and abandoning their own proposals on which they had been insisting only the day before. The United States and the United Kingdom, as they have done hitherto, are evading a solution of the disarmament problem, making an appropriate agreement dependent on a whole series of far-fetched and impracticable terms, especially with regard to control over disarmament. Such questions as the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons and their removal from armaments, the reduction of military expenditures and military budgets, the dismantling of military bases on foreign territories, and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the N.A.T.O. and

Warsaw Treaty countries respectively are in general glossed over in the proposals of the western powers. This alone shows that these powers are far from making any efforts to facilitate the success of the disarmament talks.

Furthermore, they are artificially complicating agreement on the reduction of armed forces by making it conditional on the solving of political problems that have nothing in common with disarmament, such as, for instance, the German problem. Even such a comparatively simple question as the cessation of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests is linked by them with other much more complicated questions of disarmament on which it has so far not been possible to reach agreement owing to the attitude of the western powers themselves. It must be said that the disarmament talks were held in recent years in an utterly abnormal situation. In the United Nations Disarmament Sub-Committee where these talks were mainly held in the last three years, the Soviet Union was opposed by four members of the North Atlantic bloc—the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Canada—which blocked any proposals that did not accord with the policy of this military bloc. As a result the Sub-Committee could not make any advance in drafting a disarmament agreement and was used as a screen for the arms race pursued by the western powers.

It is only natural that the Soviet government cannot but draw a definite conclusion from the situation created when the governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and some of their N.A.T.O. allies use the United Nations disarmament bodies to prevent agreement, while seeking to create the impression that some progress is being made in the talks and that a disarmament agreement is just round the corner. At the last session of the United Nations General Assembly the Soviet government tabled a proposal for setting up a disarmament commission which would include all the member-states of the United Nations. Such a commission

would enable all states, large and small, to take a direct part in the discussion on a problem which is of deep concern to all peoples. Of course, this alone would not solve the problem, but such a method of holding the talks would put an end to the secret discussions behind closed doors and would enable the peoples to exercise supervision over the disarmament talks.

Can there be any objections to such a proposal from those who really pay heed to the peoples' demand for disarmament and want to break the deadlock regarding the talks? No, there can be no objections.

Nevertheless, the western powers, and particularly the United States, are emphatically opposed to this proposal.

There was another proposal at the General Assembly to which the Soviet government agreed. I am referring to the Albanian proposal, supported by many other countries and envisaging the establishment of a somewhat narrower disarmament commission in which the socialist countries and countries pursuing a neutral policy would account for at least half of the members. It would seem that this proposal should have been acceptable to all, since broader participation by countries following a peaceful policy would further the success of the disarmament talks. And yet the western powers opposed this proposal too, seeking to preserve the dominance of members of their military groupings in the United Nations disarmament bodies.

The United States, as in the past, did not hesitate to exert crude pressure on the countries dependent on it, in order to prevent the establishment of a body capable of fruitful negotiations.

Though the U.S.A. was obliged to agree to a certain extension of the existing commission, this was done in such a way that the United States and its partners in military blocs still hold an overwhelming majority of seats in the commission; 16 of the 25 members of the commission belong to western military groupings.

The fact that the governments of the United States and Britain pushed through the General Assembly a resolution seeking to establish in advance that any future discussion on the disarmament problem should be held in their way and on their terms is nothing but an infringement of the very idea of reaching a settlement on disarmament and an attempt to bury this idea. Such moves have never succeeded and never will succeed, and all resolutions seeking to dictate to the Soviet Union and other peaceful countries conditions that are unacceptable to them will be still-born. In view of all this the Soviet Union was compelled to state that it could not take part in the work of a commission the purpose of which was, in effect, to obstruct the work of disarmament and to mislead the peoples.

The governments of the United States and Britain are always trying to secure military advantages for themselves, to the detriment of the security interests of the Soviet Union, making use of the Soviet Union's well-known interest in disarmament and the promotion of peace.

Moreover, hasn't the American government demonstrated its unwillingness to approach the disarmament problem in a businesslike way, by doing everything in its power to bar People's China from participating, along with the other great powers, in the discussion on the disarmament problems? The American government is putting itself in a ridiculous position: western proposals providing for measures towards disarmament, should, in their very conception, also extend to the Chinese People's Republic, and yet the American government continues to behave as if the great Chinese state did not exist. Small wonder, therefore, that more and more Americans are beginning to point to the absurdity of the American attitude towards China.

For a long time the United States and Britain based their calculations on the assumption that they were ahead in atomic armaments. They said therefore: "Why disarm if the U.S.A. and

Britain have the advantage?" But life has shown these calculations to be false. Nothing is left of the illusions under which the statesmen of these countries were labouring throughout almost the whole of the postwar period. These illusions have been blown sky high by the Soviet Union's recent scientific and technical achievements. But have the rulers of these countries learned anything from this fact? Not yet, unfortunately. The men who shape the foreign policy of the United States—and Britain—now reason as follows: "Since the Soviet Union has outstripped the U.S.A. and Britain in the field of science and technology, it is necessary first to catch up with the Soviet Union and to intensify the arms race still more, particularly in the sphere of nuclear and missile production." Such a situation, of course, can suit only the biggest capitalist monopolies that are getting ever-increasing profits from the manufacture of armaments. It cuts right across the vital interests of the peoples.

The arms race has never been so dangerous as it is today, when the destructive potential of the latest types of weapons defies any comparison with that of the weapons used even in the Second World War, and when military techniques, spurred on by the arms race, are constantly developing.

It is time for responsible statesmen in the West to realise that disarmament is not an object of diplomatic bargaining but the most urgent task of our time, the immediate solution of which is being ever more insistently demanded by the peoples, and to realise that no juggling with votes in the United Nations, no calls for continuing the cold war can stifle this demand or remove it from the agenda. Even the most rabid champions of the arms race today have to take into consideration the unity of the socialist countries, the ever-growing understanding and co-operation of all the countries upholding the interests of peace. The situation in the world today is different from what it was even a few months ago. The Soviet earth satellites have improved the political climate on our planet. They

are doing a big job for peace and, not least, for disarmament.

The organisers of the latest session of the N.A.T.O. Council made a big effort to turn it into a demonstration of the solidarity of the N.A.T.O. countries with the policy of military preparations and the arms race. However, the session showed that these hopes were not to be fulfilled. It is highly significant, for instance, that those who took part had to revise the agenda drawn up in Washington and London and had to include questions far removed from the aims of this military bloc. Suffice it to say that the session had to take up questions bearing on the disarmament talks and discuss the Soviet government's proposals put forward in Prime Minister Bulganin's recent messages to the heads of government of the N.A.T.O. countries and in the Notes to all the member-countries of the United Nations.

To quote foreign newspapers, the Soviet Union was present, as it were, unseen, at the N.A.T.O. session, influencing the entire course of the session. The representatives of Norway, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany and some other countries went on record in favour of a thorough study of the Soviet proposals. The *Washington Post* and *Times-Herald*, for instance, wrote that what was happening in Paris was tantamount to a revolt on a hitherto unknown scale against Dulles' habit of turning down Soviet proposals merely because of their origin.

The plans for establishing in Europe a network of American rocket launching bases and stockpiles of atomic warheads for them also came up against considerable opposition. The Norwegian Prime Minister, Mr. Gerhardsen, said that Norway would not allow atomic stockpiles or medium-range rocket launching installations on her territory. A similar statement was made by the Danish Prime Minister, Mr. Hansen. The Soviet government has a proper appreciation of the sober assessment of the situation made by these Scandinavian statesmen.

The position of the government of the

Federal Republic of Germany was affected to a certain extent by the alarm of the West German population at the American plans for turning the country into a nuclear weapons dump. Chancellor Adenauer had to make a statement to the effect that Western Germany would not hurry with the question of American missile bases on her territory. However, the statement by the government of the Federal Republic on American missile bases, which might be considered as a shift towards a more reasonable view of West German interests, cannot be squared with Adenauer's pressing demands for the delivery of all types of weapons to the West German Bundeswehr and Western Germany's participation in modern weapon research, including rocket research.

One cannot ignore the fact that the possession of atomic weapons by the West German forces which have learned nothing from the experience of the past wars and are merely awaiting an opportune moment to push the country again on to the path of war, might have grave consequences. This is obvious, if only from the fact that some people who are prominent in Western Germany today do not scruple to express disagreement with the present frontiers of certain European states. Would not such a step as the equipping of the West German army with atomic weapons result in a dangerous atomic arms race between European countries?

Nevertheless, the course of events and, to a certain extent, the results at the last N.A.T.O. session show that tendencies to provide conditions for peaceful co-existence and to halt the arms race are becoming increasingly apparent in international relations. It is gratifying to note the broadly favourable public response and understanding in the N.A.T.O. countries for the Soviet government's recent appeals to the governments of 83 states, and the proposals aimed at strengthening peace that have been voiced in those appeals. Isn't this new and striking evidence that the foreign policy of this country, shaped by the Communist Party and its central committee, is in harmony with

the wishes of the overwhelming majority of mankind? It has the support of millions upon millions of people who only yesterday were under the sway of militarist propaganda. Countless millions in the East and West are looking with hope and confidence to the Soviet Union, which consistently and resolutely upholds the great cause of world peace.

The communiqué on the N.A.T.O. session that has just been published speaks of readiness to take part in a meeting of Foreign Ministers on disarmament. It is not hard to see that this statement was included in the communiqué because of the difficult situation in which the guiding spirits of the arms race and the cold war had found themselves. The U.S. Secretary of State—and his touch is readily apparent in this statement—needed this outwardly conciliatory note in order to mislead the peoples, who really want an end to the arms race and the cold war. After all, it is well known that barely a month has passed since the United Nations, under flagrant pressure from the United States, passed a resolution approving the western attitude on disarmament—an attitude which is scarcely calculated to achieve disarmament and which has led the talks on this subject into a blind alley. We are, in fact, being invited to sit down again at a conference table with the same N.A.T.O. members with whom we have been patiently negotiating until now and to launch again into sterile discussions which do not advance the cause of disarmament one jot.

One readily perceives here a desire to call the conference merely in order to put forward one's own terms, one's own programme for the talks. As the Soviet Union cannot accept these terms, since they are in no way conducive to disarmament, it is not difficult to imagine the situation that would develop at the meeting. The western powers would not fail to accuse the Soviet Union of refusing to compromise, of sabotaging the agreement, and thus mislead public opinion. Judge for yourselves—can anything useful be expected from a Foreign Ministers' conference composed in that way?

The Soviet Union, as hitherto, sincerely wants to bring about an agreement on all the problems of disarmament, to end the cold war. For many years the Soviet government has made strenuous efforts to reach a settlement with the western powers. Nothing has come of these efforts, because of the western powers' unwillingness to compromise.

The crux of the matter, therefore, is not that the talks have not been held on a ministerial level until now and that a conference of ministers is now being proposed, but that the western powers should abandon their dangerous policy of military preparations, of fomenting the cold war and intensifying the arms race, and should agree to the honest negotiations which the Soviet government has advocated and continues to advocate.

Comrades Deputies, the Soviet government, having analysed the course of many years of disarmament negotiations and the attitudes and proposals of the parties concerned, has arrived at the conclusion that in view of the present international situation, marked by tension in the relations between states, the only realistic way to solve the disarmament problem would be to re-establish and strengthen international confidence. It is necessary to find common points of departure and, where the situation allows, to take the first, even if tentative, step towards disarmament. If the western powers are not prepared to agree to joint disarmament measures, what is there to prevent us from agreeing on mutual undertakings of a moral nature or on such individual measures as would contribute to the re-establishment of international confidence and help to pave the way for the solution of the disarmament problem as a whole?

It is the Soviet government's opinion that such practical measures are feasible at the present time.

Appropriate proposals were put forward by the Soviet government in the messages of the Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, N. A. Bulganin, and in the Notes addressed by the U.S.S.R. government to the govern-

ments of the member-states of the United Nations. I shall briefly recapitulate these proposals.

The Soviet government announced that it was ready to end, as from January 1, 1958, all tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons, if the governments of the United States and Britain would give a similar pledge. The ending of tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons would freeze the situation with regard to these weapons in the countries possessing them at the level of January 1, 1958. As you see, the Soviet Union, which is not preparing war and is not planning to attack any state, is ready to refrain from further improving these weapons. Why, then, do the governments of the United States and Britain, which declare that they do not intend to attack anyone either, refuse to undertake, jointly with the Soviet Union, to refrain from further improving these weapons?

The Soviet Union also proposes to the United States and Britain to give a joint pledge not to use atomic and hydrogen weapons. This proposal could be easily carried out, since it involves neither complex international controls over its fulfilment nor any material expenditures, while its great significance for the cause of peace is self-evident.

The Soviet Union and other Warsaw Treaty countries have for a long time been suggesting to the N.A.T.O. countries the signing of a non-aggression treaty. Now it is up to the governments of the United States, Britain, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and other N.A.T.O. member-states to decide this question, which in many respects would help to ease international tension and strengthen European security.

Sometimes the opponents of this proposal argue that the very idea of non-aggression treaties has not justified itself and refer to the violation of such treaties by Nazi Germany. The groundless nature of such arguments is obvious. Who would deny that the violation by Nazi Germany of non-aggression treaties with other states placed her before the whole world in the position of an aggressor who had treacherously broken her international obligations? Isn't it a fact

that this played its part in isolating Nazi Germany in the international political scene and in consolidating the forces of the anti-Nazi coalition? It was not the idea of non-aggression treaties that was compromised but the violators of those treaties. This warrants the question: Doesn't the idea of non-aggression treaties seem unsuitable to some people because in our time, too, it is a serious obstacle to those who harbour plans for aggression? The proposal for establishing in Europe a zone free from atomic and hydrogen weapons merits serious attention, since very real prerequisites exist for its practical implementation. It is known that on the initiative of the Polish government, supported by Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic, it has been proposed that the territories of these states should be included in the zone free from atomic and hydrogen weapons, if the government of Western Germany, for its part, will also give a pledge not to station foreign nuclear weapons on West German territory and not to organise its own manufacture of such weapons.

The governments of Poland, the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia have agreed to include the territories of their countries in such a zone. Now it is up to the fourth state of this zone—the Federal Republic of Germany—to say the word. As for the Soviet government, it fully supports the proposal of the governments of Poland, Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic for the establishment of a zone in Europe free from nuclear weapons, and is ready, for its part, to enter into negotiations to this effect with the governments of the United States and Britain. The establishment in Central Europe of such a zone, with a population of more than 100 million people, would greatly change the situation in Europe.

The Soviet Union believes that states should undertake the obligation to put an end to the war propaganda which is daily being conducted in some western countries through the press, radio, films, television and other channels. War propaganda is a crime against peace, no matter what false arguments about so-

called "freedom of speech" are used as an excuse. Is there any great difference between those people who are now calling for atom and hydrogen bombs to be dropped on those countries whose internal system they do not like, and those Nazis who, 11 years ago, sat in the dock before the International Tribunal and who had begun their careers with similar appeals? The difference is not great.

Considering that the cause of disarmament cannot be allowed to remain in the present blind alley, the Soviet government proposes that in the near future a special session of the United Nations General Assembly or an international disarmament conference should be called.

A summit conference of representatives of capitalist and socialist countries could undoubtedly help to achieve an early and positive solution to these burning problems and the Soviet government has made statements to this effect before.

Those who stand for continuing the course of the arms race often argue that now that the Soviet Union has the ascendancy in the field of the most modern weapons, renunciation of such a course would be taken by many states, and above all by the neutrals, as an admission of the weakness of the western powers, and especially of the United States. They claim that renunciation of such a course might affect the authority

and prestige of the United States and of the North Atlantic bloc as a whole.

It is precisely the present course of the United States and some of its N.A.T.O. partners that is undermining their authority and prestige, and the further it goes, the stronger this effect will be. The Americans themselves, better than anyone else, could tell us about that. We are convinced that the replacing of the "positions of strength" policy, the policy of keeping the world "on the brink of war," by a different policy aimed at ending the arms race, at lessening international tension and at developing co-operation among states, primarily in the field of trade, would on the contrary greatly enhance the authority and prestige of the United States as well as of other states which follow in the wake of American policy.

The Soviet Union, like the other socialist states, is doing and will do everything in its power to strengthen peace and foster in every way friendship and co-operation among the peoples and, as hitherto, will most persistently, sincerely and patiently press for an agreement to end the arms race, to relieve mankind of the menace of a devastating atomic war. In pursuance of this policy, our country relies on the firm unity of our people, on the growing power of its economy, on the solidarity of the entire socialist camp, and on the forces of peace throughout the world, which are growing stronger every day.

SPEECH BY N. S. KHRUSHCHOV

COMRADES DEPUTIES, allow me to make some observations on the international situation. I fully agree with the reply given by Foreign Minister Gromyko to the interpellation by the group of Deputies.

In speaking of the major international developments that have taken place lately, one must first of all mention the celebrations of the 40th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the meetings of representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow.

The 40th anniversary of the Great October Revolution developed into an international demonstration of the triumph of the ideas of peace and socialism and of the achievements of the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and all the socialist countries, as also of their foreign policy.

During the celebrations of the 40th anniversary of the October Revolution, meetings of representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries and of representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of 64 countries were held in Moscow. These meetings adopted the texts of historic documents—the Declaration and the Peace Manifesto.

As has been pointed out in the resolution of the plenary meeting of the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on the results of the meetings of representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties, these meetings have convincingly demonstrated the further rallying of the socialist camp and of the entire communist movement on the ideological basis of Marxism-Leninism.

The principal results of the meetings were the elaboration and proclamation of the basic tasks of the communists in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism in the present stage of world history, for the consolidation of the whole of the international communist movement and the further strengthening

of the ties between the fraternal parties. The historic significance of these meetings lies in the fact that they mark a major ideological and political victory for the world communist and working-class movement, a triumph of the principles of proletarian internationalism. The results of these meetings, which were held in a comradely, cordial atmosphere, are a telling blow at the plans of imperialist reaction, which has recently been making strenuous efforts to split the international communist movement. The warm approval given to the documents of the meetings—the Declaration and the Peace Manifesto—by millions of communists and by broad masses of the working people throughout the world spells the collapse of the hopes that the imperialists and their acolytes had placed in a "crisis" in the world communist movement.

The Declaration of the meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of socialist countries is an example of the creative development of Marxism-Leninism through the summing up of the collective experience of the Communist Parties of the socialist and capitalist countries.

The Peace Manifesto adopted by the meeting of all the Communist and Workers' Parties is of world historic importance in the struggle for world peace. It is well known that the delegation of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia took part in the meeting of the fraternal parties of all countries and in the adoption of the Peace Manifesto. This is a new step forward towards the further *rapprochement* of the Yugoslav communists with our party and the other Communist and Workers' Parties. But the League of Communists of Yugoslavia did not take part in the meeting of the fraternal parties of the socialist countries or in the signing of its Declaration. Is this a negative aspect? Naturally it is, for it shows that differences on some ideological and political issues still exist between the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and all the

other Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries. It is clear, however, that these differences are less numerous today than in the past. On many important questions the Yugoslav communists act together with all the Communist and Workers' Parties. We shall continue to pursue a policy of friendship and co-operation with the fraternal peoples of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia and seek to strengthen the ties with the League of Communists of Yugoslavia on the basis of the immutable principles of Marxism-Leninism and to overcome the ideological and political differences that still exist.

The documents adopted by the meetings have much good to say about the working class of our country and its militant vanguard, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which was the first to accomplish a victorious socialist revolution and which has achieved historic victories in the struggle for communism.

It is no accident that the enemies of socialism have concentrated, and are concentrating their fire on the Communist Parties, and particularly on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The working class of our country and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union have set an example of revolutionary struggle against the exploiters, for the interests of the working class, for the interests of the working people, for the triumph of socialism. That is why enemies want to disparage the role of the Soviet Union in the revolutionary movement and to discredit it. They have failed in this so far and they will fail in the future. They want to divide the efforts of the revolutionary Communist and Workers' Parties and to break the unity of the socialist countries. They are seeking to play off one socialist country against another, to hamstring the unity of the revolutionary forces.

The imperialists seek to cover up these insidious tactics, designed to break the unity of the socialist countries, by talk about their alleged concern for the "independence" of individual countries. When imperialist groups combat the unity of the socialist countries they pre-

sent themselves as all but defenders of the independence and sovereignty of particular countries. But when they speak of the need to unite capitalist countries in military blocs, they demand that for the sake of this unity their partners should relinquish the sovereignty of their states, alleging that there is no absolute sovereignty, that it is an anachronism.

We must maintain our vigilance. We must not let ourselves be disconcerted. We must firmly and consistently pursue a policy which will help to rally the countries of the socialist camp and further promote their unity; we must pursue a peaceful policy, a policy of strengthening co-operation and extending friendly relations between all countries on the basis of the Leninist principles of peaceful co-existence.

The results of the meetings of Communist and Workers' Parties show that the schemes of imperialist reaction to break and weaken the unity of the socialist countries, to undermine the prestige of the Soviet Union, to weaken the ties between the fraternal parties and the Communist Party of our country have failed. The meetings reaffirmed the great sympathies of the fraternal parties for our party and the peoples of the Soviet Union. Even the sworn enemies of the U.S.S.R. now have to admit that the Soviet Union's prestige stands high and unshakable in the eyes of the workers of the world and that the fraternal parties have great trust in our Communist Party.

The best reply to this trust by the communists and all the Soviet people would be to work devotedly for a communist society, to enhance still further the might of the Soviet country and the whole of the socialist camp, to struggle tirelessly for world peace, and to strengthen friendship with the workers and the democratic forces throughout the world.

We are grateful to all our friends for their trust and for their recognition of the services of our party and our people. We say to all friends and comrades that we are as young and vigorous in our struggle for communism today as we were in the days when we worked for the victory of the Great October Revolution, in the days when we fought on

the fronts of the Civil War and the Great Patriotic War.

We have preserved all the great revolutionary ardour and we assure our comrades in the struggle for the cause of the working class that we shall always be loyal to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, to the principles of proletarian internationalism, that we shall continue to regard ourselves as the vanguard which raised high the banner of Leninism and, guided by Lenin, was the first to march to the assault of capitalism, and which has carried this banner aloft for 40 years.

We assure them that we shall hold the banner of Lenin firmly in our hands, that we shall confidently advance towards communism, that we shall fight tirelessly for world peace.

Comrades, the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and all the socialist countries consistently pursue the line of easing international tension and of ending the cold war and the arms race, the line of establishing a lasting peace among the peoples on the basis of peaceful co-existence of countries with different social systems. This line springs from the very nature of the foreign policy of the socialist states. It is supported by many countries in Europe, and particularly in Asia and Africa. The movement of the peoples for peace is spreading in the capitalist countries. Nor can one fail to notice that more and more public figures are calling for an end to the cold war policy and the arms race, for international relations to be built on the basis of peaceful co-existence. We salute such outstanding statesmen as Prime Minister Nehru of India, President Sukarno of Indonesia, Prime Minister U Nu of Burma, President Nasser of Egypt, President Kuwatly of Syria, and others who are working persistently for peace.

Criticism of the "cold war" policy comes from people in various walks of life representing various sections of society—professional people, businessmen and political leaders. Proposals that a more realistic view should be taken of the international balance of power have been put forward lately by such different public leaders as Canadian

Secretary for External Affairs Smith, British philosopher Bertrand Russell, former United States Ambassador to the Soviet Union Kennan, businessman Eaton, journalist Hearst and many other public figures and statesmen of capitalist countries.

The peaceloving peoples welcome such statements because they realise what war means in present-day conditions. However, the ruling circles of the imperialist states stubbornly cling to the line of worsening relations between states, of further extending and consolidating the aggressive military blocs and of continuing the arms race. These circles, ignoring the interests of the peoples, refuse to give up their aggressive foreign policy. They do the bidding of a small but influential bunch of monopolists who would like to intensify and maintain the state of "cold war" with a view to it growing over into a "shooting war." What do the interests of the peoples matter to them? They have little concern for the fate of mankind; they are actuated by the lust to enrich themselves at the cost of the sufferings of the common people.

The imperialists have their own motto: "The worse it is for the cause of peace, the better it is for the cause of profit." A state of anxiety and alarm, the fear felt by people in face of a possible atomic war is precisely the favourable climate in which it is easiest for the imperialists to carry out their plans, to squeeze money for armaments out of the taxpayers.

The peoples are sick to death of war hysteria, of the game of nerves; the burden of taxation, which puts the squeeze primarily on the working people, has become unbearable. The total cost of the arms race in all countries, were it to be computed, would appal the people, for they would understand how great is the waste of the national wealth which, under different conditions, could be directed towards raising the standard of living of the peoples, to developing the economy and culture.

This is how things stand: if we are to steer a course towards peace, towards

settling outstanding issues by peaceful means, and not a course towards an atomic war, fraught, as it is, with disastrous consequences, the imperialists must put an end to the policy of "cold war" and the arms race and give up their hopes of changing the world by force to please the monopolies. It is a fact that the essence of the imperialist "policy of strength" is to force the Soviet Union to accept the demands of the western countries—demands having the character of ultimatums—and to "settle" certain political issues on terms which would be to the imperialists' advantage.

The western powers would like, for instance, to "settle" the problem of the people's democracies. But what do they understand by such a "settlement"? By interfering in the internal affairs of these countries, against the will of the peoples, they want to do away with the socialist gains of the working people and to restore the rule of capitalists and landowners. The imperialists also talk a lot about a "settlement" of the German problem. But how do they interpret such a "settlement"? They would like to "reunify" Germany by incorporating Eastern Germany in Western Germany, that is to say, by abolishing the socialist gains of the German Democratic Republic and increasing the military economic potential of Western Germany, and then to include this reunified Germany in the aggressive North Atlantic bloc. As you see, they want us to agree knowingly to the strengthening of German militarism and revenge-seeking.

In what way does such a "settlement" of political problems differ from a *diktat*, from a policy of ultimatums? In relation to the Soviet Union, such a policy was never successful before and naturally has no chance of success now.

We say to the representatives of the western countries, and in the first place the United States: Throw your unreasonable and sufficiently compromised "positions of strength" policy on to the rubbish heap of history, where it belongs!

Let us settle outstanding issues by peaceful negotiations, and soberly, without *diktats*; let us discuss on an equal footing the problems that are of deep concern to mankind; let us rule out war as a means of solving international problems; let us recognise the *status quo*, that is to say, the situation now prevailing in the world, characterised, as it is, by the existence of socialist and capitalist states; and let us refrain from interfering in one another's internal affairs.

We declare that however acute the ideological differences between the two systems—the socialist and the capitalist systems—we must solve questions in dispute between states, not by war, but by peaceful negotiations. We suggest that competition in inventing new weapons be replaced by peaceful competition. The victory of a social system will be decided, not by rockets, not by atomic and hydrogen bombs, but by the fact of which system ensures greater material and spiritual benefits for mankind. We believe that the socialist system is a higher form of organisation of society. Let this or that social system prove its superiority, not in the military sphere, but in the sphere of peace, in the sphere of developing the productive forces of society, science, technology and culture, in providing better living conditions for man. Tell me, what is unacceptable in this to any state, whichever system exists in it? However, the most aggressive imperialist circles of the West do not want to abolish the "cold war" and are seeking pretexts of all kinds to continue it.

The imperialist circles are seeking to intimidate the U.S.S.R. and other peace-loving countries in the hope of compelling the Soviet Union to invest more in the war industry and thus preventing it from increasing the output of consumer goods.

This is how matters stand. The imperialists dread like fire peaceful competition with the socialist system. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries do not threaten anyone with war; they have no intention of forcing

their own ideology and methods on anyone. The only thing they offer is peace and friendship among the peoples. We want to achieve mutual understanding, to establish confidence among states, to put an end to the incitement of warlike passions and bring about tranquillity, to enable the people to work in peace.

Clear, isn't it? But they tell us: "This is propaganda!" Yes, it is propaganda, but it is propaganda not for war but for peace, because in the Soviet Union, in contrast for instance to the United States, war propaganda is a grave crime and is punishable by law. What is wrong with propaganda which calls for peace! We are ready to hear such propaganda from the western powers on any day and at any hour. Instead, day after day, from official western spokesmen, generals and admirals, there come appeals for war, menacing statements to the effect that modern weapons make it possible to "destroy the Soviet Union," to "raze to the ground" whole cities, the industrial centres of our country.

When they want to say something derogatory, insulting about the peace-loving steps taken by the Soviet Union, they use that word "propaganda." By means of this trick they want to get away from the essence of the matter, because the ruling circles of the western countries have nothing with which to counter the peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries except a bellicose, aggressive policy.

In the past few days the attention of world public opinion has been centred on the messages from the government of the Soviet Union to the governments of the United States, Britain, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Turkey, Norway and Denmark, to the governments of the other member-countries of N.A.T.O. and also to the governments of all member-countries of the United Nations. The new peaceful initiative of the Soviet Union has won the approval and support of all who cherish the cause of peace and the security of the nations.

As is well known, the Soviet government declared that it was ready, as from

January 1, 1958, to discontinue the explosions of nuclear weapons, if the United States and Britain would do likewise.

The Soviet Union suggests that the U.S.S.R., the United States and Britain, which possess atomic and hydrogen weapons, should jointly pledge themselves to renounce the use of these weapons.

The Soviet Union proposes that all military blocs be dissolved and that a system of collective security be established in Europe and Asia, or at least that a non-aggression treaty be concluded between the member-states of N.A.T.O. and the Warsaw Treaty. We believe that at the present time perfectly real conditions are available for setting up in Europe a zone free from nuclear weapons.

We suggest that the situation in the Middle East be normalised, that a Soviet-American treaty of friendship be signed, that measures be taken to end war propaganda and to extend trade, scientific, cultural and sports contacts. We propose that discrimination and restrictions among states be based on mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty; non-aggression; non-interference in one another's internal affairs for political, economic or ideological considerations; equality and mutual benefit; peaceful co-existence.

These are our proposals. They are dictated by the Soviet government's sincere desire to safeguard and strengthen peace. Our peaceable policy is in no way prompted by weakness. It is appropriate to recall that only a few years ago representatives of the western powers engaged in a great deal of argument to the effect that the peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union, its proposals for easing international tension, were prompted by our alleged economic weakness and technical backwardness.

Therefore, they said, it was necessary to bring pressure to bear on the Soviet Union, to compel it under the threat of force to make political concessions and, if possible, even to compel it to give up its ideology. The outcome of these plans is all too well known.

The speculation about the weakness of the Soviet Union and the attempts to apply a policy of *diktat* in relation to it were as futile and unwise in the past as they are now.

Who at the present time does not see that our country is in its prime? Who can now doubt that the peoples of the Soviet Union and of the countries of the socialist camp, and all the progressive forces possess such powerful means as can put a curb on any persons prone to engage in military adventures? Now even the leaders of the United States and other western countries are compelled to admit that the Soviet Union has made great progress in developing its economy and culture and that its strength is increasing every day.

We have pursued, and we are continuing to pursue our peace-loving policy, because it stems from the very nature of the most peace-loving, the most humane social system—socialism.

Who does not know that the Soviet Union has more than once given concrete proofs of its peaceable nature and of its desire to ease international tension?

It would take a great deal of time to list even only the most important constructive and completely acceptable proposals presented only recently by the Soviet government to the United Nations Organisation or to individual western countries.

And how many peaceful proposals have been made by People's China and other socialist countries! Had it not been for the bitter opposition these peaceable steps encountered from the imperialist circles of the western countries, and above all the U.S.A., and had they been considered soberly, impartially and realistically, the "cold war" would long since have become a thing of the past, and tangible results would have been achieved in easing international tension.

Let us take the disarmament problem, for instance. The Soviet Union has repeatedly declared its stand on the problems of disarmament; its proposals have been aimed at "unfreezing" and at least getting out of the deadlock the problem which is of greater concern to mankind than anything else.

The Soviet Union now, as in the past, stands for a radical solution of the disarmament problem; it stands for a complete and unconditional ban on nuclear weapons, for their removal from national armaments, for the destruction of the existing stockpiles of these weapons, and for a substantial reduction of armed forces, armaments and military expenditures, with the establishment of proper international control.

Thus, for our part, we proposed the most radical measures. We made great efforts to reach agreement with the western countries on disarmament. Unfortunately we were not able to reach agreement in view of the attitude adopted by the western powers at the London talks, which took place in an absolutely abnormal atmosphere.

Is it possible to regard as normal the circumstance that in the United Nations Disarmament Sub-Committee the Soviet Union was alone in face of four representatives of N.A.T.O. countries, who turned down any Soviet proposal aimed at a disarmament agreement? While acting in this way the western representatives were misleading the public by creating the impression that talks were being held and some headway had been made.

It is clear that such a situation could no longer be tolerated. The Soviet government submitted to the last session of the United Nations General Assembly a proposal for setting up a disarmament commission composed of all the United Nations member-countries. This motion was rejected under pressure from the West.

The Assembly likewise rejected the Albanian proposal that a narrower disarmament commission be established in which representatives of the socialist countries and countries pursuing a neutral policy would have at least half the seats. It was a very reasonable proposal but it, too, unfortunately, did not meet with either understanding or support. Under American pressure, a new United Nations commission was set up, somewhat broader in composition but with the representation in the old proportion. Moreover, the western

Supplement

N. A. BULGANIN'S LETTER TO Mr. MACMILLAN and SOVIET GOVERNMENT PROPOSALS JAN. 8 1958

N. A. BULGANIN'S LETTER

DEAR PRIME MINISTER,

In my recent letter to you I was able to inform you of the Soviet government's views on the dangerous development of world events from the standpoint of peace, and I was able to set out certain proposals, which, we are convinced, if carried out, would help to ease international tension, to create an atmosphere of confidence in relations between states, and to assist in the solution by peaceful means of outstanding international problems. As you will recall, the Soviet government called for the holding, at a high level, of talks by statesmen on urgent international problems.

May I recall that, since my message to you, the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet—in its resolution of December 21, 1957, sent to the British parliament and government—has expressed the hope that the parliaments and governments of all countries will examine these proposals of the Soviet government with due attention.

We are justified in expressing satisfaction that our proposals have evoked a wide response in many countries. Judging by their own statements, the participants in the Paris meeting of the N.A.T.O. Council also discussed the Soviet Union's proposals. We welcome the speeches of those statesmen at the N.A.T.O. Council meeting in Paris who expressed support for the idea of summit

talks, for, in our view, this road of peaceful settlement is the only possible road for the peoples to safeguard their future.

Of course, the Soviet government is favourably disposed towards those statements in the declaration issued by the N.A.T.O. Council meeting which express the readiness of the countries belonging to that alliance "to settle international problems by negotiation," in order "to lay a solid foundation for a durable peace." All the same, I should also like to point out frankly that the declarations of peaceable aims by the N.A.T.O. members are not, in our opinion, in accord with those decisions of the December meeting of the N.A.T.O. Council which were directed towards continuing the "cold war" policy and intensifying the arms race. This is precisely what is meant, in particular, by the decisions to put ballistic missiles at the disposal of the Supreme Commander-in-Chief of the N.A.T.O. armed forces and to establish stockpiles of nuclear warheads, atom bases and rocket-launching sites on the territories of West European countries.

A glance at the situation that is emerging in Europe is enough to show that attempts are being made to turn the territories of the N.A.T.O. member-countries into an area stocked with foreign nuclear and rocket weapons. How can one reconcile oneself to the

The speculation about the weakness of the Soviet Union and the attempts to apply a policy of *diktat* in relation to it were as futile and unwise in the past as they are now.

Who at the present time does not see that our country is in its prime? Who can now doubt that the peoples of the Soviet Union and of the countries of the socialist camp, and all the progressive forces possess such powerful means as can put a curb on any persons prone to engage in military adventures? Now even the leaders of the United States and other western countries are compelled to admit that the Soviet Union has made great progress in developing its economy and culture and that its strength is increasing every day.

We have pursued, and we are continuing to pursue our peaceloving policy, because it stems from the very nature of the most peaceloving, the most humane social system—socialism.

Who does not know that the Soviet Union has more than once given concrete proofs of its peaceable nature and of its desire to ease international tension?

It would take a great deal of time to list even only the most important constructive and completely acceptable proposals presented only recently by the Soviet government to the United Nations Organisation or to individual western countries.

And how many peaceful proposals have been made by People's China and other socialist countries! Had it not been for the bitter opposition these peaceable steps encountered from the imperialist circles of the western countries, and above all the U.S.A., and had they been considered soberly, impartially and realistically, the "cold war" would long since have become a thing of the past, and tangible results would have been achieved in easing international tension.

Let us take the disarmament problem, for instance. The Soviet Union has repeatedly declared its stand on the problems of disarmament; its proposals have been aimed at "unfreezing" and at least getting out of the deadlock the problem which is of greater concern to mankind than anything else.

The Soviet Union now, as in the past, stands for a radical solution of the disarmament problem; it stands for a complete and unconditional ban on nuclear weapons, for their removal from national armaments, for the destruction of the existing stockpiles of these weapons, and for a substantial reduction of armed forces, armaments and military expenditures, with the establishment of proper international control.

Thus, for our part, we proposed the most radical measures. We made great efforts to reach agreement with the western countries on disarmament. Unfortunately we were not able to reach agreement in view of the attitude adopted by the western powers at the London talks, which took place in an absolutely abnormal atmosphere.

Is it possible to regard as normal the circumstance that in the United Nations Disarmament Sub-Committee the Soviet Union was alone in face of four representatives of N.A.T.O. countries, who turned down any Soviet proposal aimed at a disarmament agreement? While acting in this way the western representatives were misleading the public by creating the impression that talks were being held and some headway had been made.

It is clear that such a situation could no longer be tolerated. The Soviet government submitted to the last session of the United Nations General Assembly a proposal for setting up a disarmament commission composed of all the United Nations member-countries. This motion was rejected under pressure from the West.

The Assembly likewise rejected the Albanian proposal that a narrower disarmament commission be established in which representatives of the socialist countries and countries pursuing a neutral policy would have at least half the seats. It was a very reasonable proposal but it, too, unfortunately, did not meet with either understanding or support. Under American pressure, a new United Nations commission was set up, somewhat broader in composition but with the representation in the old proportion. Moreover, the western

powers forced through a resolution laying down in advance a programme suitable for them and being in the nature of an ultimatum to the peaceful countries. Is it possible to describe as realistic a policy which has as its aim to impose the will of a group of countries on other countries, trampling underfoot the basic principles of the United Nations and undermining its foundations?

The United Nations was set up to solve disputed issues by peaceful means so that its decisions might take into account the interests of all member-countries and be acceptable to them. And yet the resolution I mentioned is in the nature of a *diktat*, and discriminates against a number of peaceful countries. The Soviet Union said that with things as they were, it would not take part in a commission where the vast majority of seats were held by countries belonging to aggressive military blocs. What can such a commission do if the other side is absent from it? Its work will be sterile and doomed to failure.

The Soviet Union will continue to press for reasonable agreements on the questions of disarmament, which are the most burning questions of our time. In order to achieve positive results it is necessary to give up the attempts to make a solution of the problems of disarmament artificially conditional on the solution of political questions like, for instance, the German question, as the western powers have been doing.

The Soviet Union proposed that a conference of the heads of government of socialist and capitalist countries be called to discuss in a businesslike way and on an equal footing the problems that have long been of deep concern to mankind, including the problem of disarmament, and to find mutually acceptable solutions. We consider that such a conference could be preceded by a meeting of representatives of the two strongest powers—the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. There can hardly be any doubt that if agreement were reached between the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union, without, of course, any prejudice to other countries, the situation in the world

would change considerably for the better.

We have always held that positive results could be achieved at a meeting of representatives of socialist and capitalist countries. What do we need for this? Firstly, it is necessary to desist from discussing at such a conference the problems on which the sides are divided ideologically, such as the ways in which the socialist and capitalist countries develop. Let the peoples themselves settle these questions. Secondly, it is necessary to admit the existence of both socialist and capitalist countries, not to interfere in one another's affairs, not to resort to cold war methods, and to renounce attempts to change the existing situation by force. If the representatives of the western powers proceed from the assumption that there exists only the capitalist system and ignore the socialist countries, it will be impossible to come to agreement on the basis of mutual understanding. If the western powers recognise the *status quo*, one may safely proceed with such a meeting, for it will then be easy to reach agreement on a multitude of questions and to provide conditions for the normalisation of relations between countries, for a peaceful and tranquil life for the people.

But we are told: "It is useless to meet the Soviet Union, for it is unyielding and 'tough' in its attitude, does not keep its word and does not honour its commitments once any agreement is reached." There are absolutely no grounds for these allegations. This could well be passed over, were it not for the fact that some officials in the West have recently made it a rule to misinform world public opinion. Thus Mr. Dulles, and later Dr. Adenauer, recently alleged that an agreement on German reunification had been reached at the Geneva four-power summit conference and that the Soviet Union was not complying with the decisions adopted. This allegation does not conform to reality and is contrary to the facts. It is surprising that the communiqué of the latest session of the N.A.T.O. Council

repeated this false story of Mr. Dulles.

Let us recall what the heads of government agreed upon at the Geneva conference and what the position of the Soviet government was.

The directives of the four heads of government to their Foreign Ministers said that the solution of the German question and the reunification of Germany through free elections should be accomplished in line with the national interests of the German people and the interests of European security.

Furthermore, the statement made by the Soviet delegation at the final meeting expressly emphasised that the Soviet government proceeded from the assumption that one should consider facts in settling the German question, that it was necessary to bear in mind that there existed two German states, the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany, and that it was impossible to suggest a mechanical merger, that the German question could not be settled without representatives of both German states.

Finally, it was stated at a public meeting in Berlin immediately after the end of the Geneva conference that what was needed was an approach whereby the German problem would be solved by the Germans themselves, who can undoubtedly choose the right road for Germany's development.

Such was the attitude of the Soviet government which our delegation abided by at the Geneva conference. That attitude was reaffirmed at the Geneva Foreign Ministers' meeting, held soon afterwards, where the Soviet representative again stressed that the German question should be settled by the Germans themselves. That is still our attitude today. Why then, and on what grounds does Mr. Dulles allege that the Soviet Union does not honour its commitments? The inconsistency of his statements is so obvious that even the bourgeois press has exposed them.

Thus the well-known British commentator Richard Scott wrote in the December 6 issue of the *Manchester Guardian*:

"Mr. Dulles is in danger of creating for himself the reputation of a professional anti-Soviet, someone to whom every action by the Soviet government appears suspect or worse by reason of its origin rather than its nature.

"That is a reputation which no one who is responsible for America's foreign relations can afford. As long as it is necessary and possible to maintain relations with the Russians, it is useless to leave the responsibility for their conduct in the hands of someone who is openly predisposed to mistrust the Soviet government, and therefore to doubt the value of trying to negotiate with it. But this is exactly the attitude that Mr. Dulles appears to hold.

"In an interview with a B.B.C. correspondent in Washington on Tuesday,* Mr. Dulles claimed that the Russians were the first nation to turn treaty-breaking into a regular, accepted means of gaining their own ends. After taking part in twelve conferences with the Russians, he thought very little of value had emerged from these conferences 'primarily because the Soviet cannot be relied on to live up to their promises.'

"In support of this very sweeping assertion, Mr. Dulles referred to the 'Summit' conference in Geneva in July, 1955. He claimed that an agreement had been reached at that conference that Germany should be reunified through free elections, and that this agreement had been torn up by the Russians 'almost within weeks of having been made.'

"This is the sort of shadowy half-truth," Scott writes further, "which the Russians use so effectively in their own propaganda, and which sometimes causes less professional anti-Soviets than Mr. Dulles to despair of Soviet good faith. The fact that last night's Anglo-German communiqué also complains that the Soviet government had not yet fulfilled its 'obligation' to reunify Germany through free elections does not make it any less—or is it more?—of a half-truth."

* December 5.

"All that was ever agreed at the Geneva 'Summit' conference was a directive by the four heads of government to their Foreign Ministers to guide them in their future talks."

After quoting the directives of the heads of government to their Foreign Ministers, Scott stresses that there is no suggestion in the directives that the Soviet government had committed itself to holding free all-German elections, irrespective of what could or could not be agreed on other related matters.

"And those who attended that 'Summit' conference," Scott declares, "will remember that the central difference between the Russian and the western delegations was precisely over the question as to which should come first—German unity or European security. In the end both sides had to agree that the two problems were directly linked; and the wording of the directive in fact makes this quite clear."

It is highly characteristic that such comments regarding Dulles' statements are not the only ones. Another British commentator who wastes no sympathies on the Soviet Union, Crankshaw, commented as follows in the *Observer* on December 8 on the same subject: "Now apart from the fact that the duty of a Foreign Secretary is to plug away at negotiation (if he feels unable to fulfil this duty, then his next duty is to resign), this simply is not true. The Russians do not freely break agreements. . . . No such agreement was made at Geneva, as everybody knows."

Such is the real worth of Mr. Dulles' statements! Can such groundless statements contribute to the establishment of international trust, to a correct approach to the solution of international issues?

Comrades, there have just been issued the declaration and communiqué of the N.A.T.O. Council session in which the heads of government of the countries belonging to this bloc took part. As is evident from comments in the foreign press, what is most noteworthy is the fact that under the impact of public opinion the question of the messages of the Soviet government was put on the

N.A.T.O. session's agenda. One should welcome the action of those heads of government of the western countries who took a positive attitude towards the idea suggested in the messages of the Soviet government of a meeting of the heads of government in order to discuss the pressing international problems of our times. Characteristically, many leaders of the delegations of western countries had to begin and wind up their statements at the N.A.T.O. session by speaking about peace.

The documents adopted by the N.A.T.O. session also have much to say about peace. Thus the declaration contains the statements: "Faithful to the Charter of the United Nations we reaffirm that our alliance will never be used for aggressive purposes. We are always ready to settle international problems by negotiation, taking into account the legitimate interests of all. We seek an end to world tension, and intend to promote peace, economic prosperity and social progress throughout the world." Not badly worded!

"We continue," says the declaration, "firmly to stand for comprehensive and controlled disarmament, which we believe can be reached by stages. In spite of disappointments we remain ready to discuss any reasonable proposal to reach this goal and to lay a solid foundation for a durable peace. This is the only way to dispel the anxieties arising from the armaments race."

We, the Soviet Union, are ready to put our signature under such statements about peace and disarmament. Why can't the countries belonging to N.A.T.O. and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation adopt a common non-aggression declaration. Why should they not pledge themselves to end calls for war, to abolish the state of "cold war," and the arms race? Why shouldn't they do away with restrictions and discrimination in trade? Why shouldn't they develop relations in the fields of science, culture and sport?

That would be a fine beginning, in keeping with the interests of all peace-loving peoples.

The heads of government of the countries of the North Atlantic bloc declared that they had gathered in Paris without aggressive intentions, that N.A.T.O. as a whole, and each country individually, did not seek war, that they were seeking peace and only taking measures to defend themselves from possible aggression. But since no one threatens the western powers with aggression, the situation thus becomes favourable for easing international tension, for strengthening peace.

However, one cannot overlook the fact that along with words about their desire for peace and disarmament, the documents of the N.A.T.O. session contain pronouncements which refute these peace-loving statements. Apparently the N.A.T.O. organisers encountered no small difficulties in drafting the declaration and the communiqué, since they were confronted with no easy task. Faced with the demand of all peace-loving peoples for the ending of the "cold war" and the arms race, they had to insert peace-loving statements into their documents. But these statements were hedged to such an extent by various reservations, conditions and demands, that these correct provisions were virtually nullified. Thus it transpires that what remains is the old course of fomenting the "cold war" and the arms race.

If the heads of government of the N.A.T.O. countries are sincerely striving for peace, they will meet with full understanding and support from the Soviet Union, from all the peace-loving states which consider it to be their sacred duty to strengthen peace and international security. If everybody honestly strives for peace, war will be excluded as a means of settling outstanding problems between states.

We hope that the forces of peace and the will of the peoples opposed to the threat of a new war will triumph over the forces of war. The peoples will achieve their goal and finally compel the governments to seek solutions of problems through peaceful co-existence; as for the Soviet Union, it will continue

striving for the ending of the "cold war," the ending of the arms race, for the establishment of confidence between states and the development of friendly co-operation. But it will obviously take time to establish such relations.

At the same time we cannot but reckon with the fact that the burden of military expenditures weighs down on the masses of the people and affects the matter of raising the living standards of millions, and that the interests of improving the living standards of millions of people call for urgent measures to end the arms race. If the N.A.T.O. countries live up to their statements about peace, the Soviet Union will take, as it has frequently done in the past, unilateral steps to reduce its armed forces and military expenditures still further, releasing funds and manpower for peaceful construction, for raising the Soviet people's living standards.

We are realists in matters of policy and we cannot but take into account the fact that the communiqué of the N.A.T.O. Council session contains statements which can in no way be reconciled with words about peace. The decision to place ballistic missiles at the disposal of the N.A.T.O. Supreme Command, to set up nuclear warhead dumps, atomic bases and rocket launching ramps in the territories of West European states constitutes a direct threat to the cause of peace. Consequently, the Soviet Union will take steps to strengthen its defences, to develop up-to-date means capable of dealing a crushing retaliatory blow in the event of the imperialists unleashing a new war.

We do not conceal the fact that if agreement is not reached on disarmament, the Soviet Union will pay due attention to developing the latest types of armaments. Of course, it will do this on a reasonable scale so as not to inflate our budget, not to burden our economy and our people by large expenditures for these purposes.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly declared that it is imperative to end the arms race and outlaw weapons of mass annihilation. The latest types of arma-

ments are so powerful that their employment in a war would imperil the existence of whole countries. In the event of a war being unleashed, devastating retaliatory blows will be struck both at countries on whose territories the N.A.T.O. war bases are situated, and at countries which are setting up these bases for aggressive purposes. Nowadays there is no place in the world where the aggressor could escape just punishment.

This is why we cannot fail to welcome the sober statements made by the Prime Minister of Norway, Mr. Gerhardsen, and the Prime Minister of Denmark, Mr. Hansen, who, conscious of the national interests of their countries, refused to open the territories of their countries for the deployment of rocket and nuclear weapons. We cannot but point to the grim consequences which may be entailed by the consent of the governments of some European states to the setting up of atomic bases and rocket ramps in their territories.

We are somewhat surprised by the bellicosity of the Italian and Turkish statesmen. They come out in favour of atomic and hydrogen weapons, in favour of rocket bases being set up on the territories of their countries. This is hard to understand. Italy's geographical position is such that she cannot in fact use ballistic or other rockets without violating the neutrality of countries which separate Italy from the Soviet Union. Ballistic rockets are known to travel only in straight lines. It is also a matter of common knowledge that the war bases and rocket ramps are intended to be used against the Soviet Union and other peace-loving states.

But these rockets cannot be employed against the Soviet Union from Italian bases without violating the sovereignty of Austria and Yugoslavia. There can be no doubt that the peace-loving peoples will raise their voices against this threat.

Regrettable, too, is the attitude of the leaders of Turkey, a country that is a neighbour of ours. The presence of atomic bases and rocket launching sites on Turkish territory confronts the peace-

ful population of that country with the danger of a catastrophe. Obviously the bellicose Turkish leaders do not realise clearly enough how hot are the objects they wish to secure, and forget that they are liable to burn their fingers.

This also holds good for other countries whose leaders agree to the establishment of military bases.

It should be hoped that common sense will prevail and that the leaders who are assuming the grave responsibility for the establishment of military bases on the territories of their countries will come to their senses in time to prevent themselves from being drawn on to the road of dangerous ventures.

Is it not clear that atomic bases and rocket launching sites will become centres of attraction in the event of a military clash and will be subjected to a destructive retaliatory blow? We have no intention at all of intimidating anyone. We are saying this only in order to give warning of the grave danger which overshadows the countries that are being turned into war bases at the will of those who engineer aggressive military groupings. This is no trifling matter.

While establishing military bases on foreign territories, the leaders of the western powers, and above all the United States, want to convince everyone that they are intended to safeguard the security of the peoples. But this is a deception. In reality, modern military bases inevitably confront the peaceful populations of whole countries with the danger of utter annihilation.

The gravity of this danger can be judged by the fact that a considerable number of American aircraft carrying atomic and hydrogen weapons are patrolling on a round-the-clock schedule over various countries in which American air force bases are situated.

Just imagine if one of these pilots—not even from evil intent, but owing to a nervous breakdown or through misunderstanding an order—were to drop that deadly load on the territory of some country. Then, according to the logic of war, an immediate retaliatory blow would be delivered. In that way a world war might be started.

But we can also imagine another case: during one of those "patrols" over the territory where air force bases are situated, a plane may become involved in an accident or technical mishap, which is quite possible no matter how perfect the machine may be. Then the deadly load will drop on the peaceful population of the country which these planes are allegedly supposed to protect. This may result in the death of millions of people.

You see that atomic bases, set up under the pretext of safeguarding the security of peoples, are actually, every day and every hour, a deadly danger to these peoples. Do the peoples of the countries on whose territories the military bases are established know or sense that they may become the first atomic or hydrogen bomb victims even in peacetime?

They must wake up before it is too late and call to order those who are gambling with the destiny of the peoples. Society must find enough strength to curb the war gamblers in time.

The organisers of the imperialist aggressive blocs try to camouflage their real intentions by an outcry about a "threat" emanating from international communism, about its desire for world domination.

Thus the declaration of the N.A.T.O. session, without any grounds, asserts that "the communist rulers again gave clear warning of their determination to press on to domination over the entire world, if possible by subversion, if necessary by violence."

A very familiar trick! During the decades of their courageous struggle for the interests of the workers, the communists have often heard such absolutely groundless assertions. But the communists have advanced and are advancing from victory to victory. They are inspired by the noble ideas of scientific communism, which expresses the basic interests of the working class, of all the working people. This is why the communists do not need to impose their ideas on anyone by force. The ideas of communism are the most pro-

gressive ideas of our epoch; they live everywhere where there are people. It is impossible to destroy these ideas, just as it is impossible to destroy the people.

The process of historic development is inexorable. It is not to be halted by any reactionary forces. If they try to do this by force of arms and unleash a war, they will thus be digging their own graves. The peoples will no longer tolerate a system engendering war and bringing sufferings and privations to mankind.

Therefore the only way out is the peaceful co-existence of the two systems, their peaceful competition.

The idea of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems is unanimously approved by all the peace-loving peoples. It found support at the last session of the United Nations General Assembly, which appealed to all states urging them to exert efforts to strengthen international peace and develop friendly relations and co-operation, and also to settle their disputes peacefully. Thus, the principles of peaceful co-existence have been approved by the representatives of most of the countries of the world.

The communiqué of the N.A.T.O. Council session says that its participants have reviewed the situation in the Middle East and confirmed their support for the independence and sovereignty of the states in this region. But those who took part in the session lacked the courage to condemn the aggression launched against Egypt by Britain, France and Israel—two of those countries being members of the North Atlantic Alliance. What weight, then, can such words as "independence" and "sovereignty" have, if just a little more than a year ago the blood of the courageous Egyptians was spilt. Only the intervention of peace-loving states, including the Soviet Union, curbed the aggression which threatened to grow into a world war.

Some advocates of the arms race frankly declare that a shrinkage of military expenditure would cause serious difficulties in the economic field and

would involve the curtailment of production and unemployment. Only persons who are indifferent to the future of the peoples can think along these lines.

How is it possible to place the interests of a handful of monopolists above the interests of whole nations and to improve business for the former at the expense of the sufferings of millions of people? Is it impossible to find a use for the huge productive capacities of the capitalist countries, to regear them to the production of peaceful goods needed to satisfy the everyday requirements of the people? Are not millions of people living in poverty and privation in the United States? Are there no slums and are there not great masses of homeless people? The same situation prevails in any capitalist country. Isn't it possible to channel the many billions spent on the arms race towards the development of the peaceful economy, the improvement of the people's living standards, and economic aid for the peoples of underdeveloped countries, who are poor precisely because the imperialist colonialists plundered them for centuries?

If restrictions and discrimination were abolished and the trade barriers between the East and the West broken down, great opportunities would open up before the United States, Britain, France and Western Germany for marketing their peaceful output. This would make for the improvement of the living standards in all countries. The extension of trade, based on mutual benefit, and the development of scientific, cultural and sport contacts would make for bringing the peoples closer together, for co-operation between them on the principles of peaceful co-existence.

In assessing the present-day international situation, it should be admitted that favourable conditions for the consolidation of peace are now emerging.

The peoples of the Soviet Union will continue to uphold the cause of peace without stinting their efforts, and will strengthen international friendship, con-

sistently abiding by the great principles of the peace-loving Leninist foreign policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet government.

Dear comrades, the year 1957 is drawing to a close. We are on the threshold of the new year—1958; 1957 was a good year and I think that 1958 will be even better!

The outgoing year has brought the peoples of the Soviet Union great successes in the development of industry, the advancement of agriculture, the raising of cultural and living standards, brilliant achievements in science and engineering, successes in strengthening the international position of our country, in further enhancing its prestige. This year has been marked by a truly historic feat of our glorious scientists, engineers, technicians and workers, who were the first to create artificial earth satellites that are now circling our planet. They glorify the successes of our people, the triumph of the ideas of socialism, and herald the progress of Soviet science and engineering. The year 1957 will go down in the annals of history as that in which all progressive mankind celebrated the 40th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, as a year that saw the rallying together of the forces of the world communist movement and outstanding victories of that movement, a year that saw the further weakening of international imperialism and reaction.

We are ushering in the new year, 1958, looking with confidence towards our future. In this year the attention of the Communist Party and all Soviet people will be concentrated on fulfilling the vast plans for building communism—plans worked out in accordance with the decisions of the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. The great Lenin called our party the party of trailblazers, because a new communist society is being established under its leadership. The recent plenary meeting of the central committee of the C.P.S.U. discussed the results of the meeting of fraternal Communist and Workers' Parties and the work of the Soviet trade unions. The present session of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet has

examined and endorsed the State Plan and the State Budget for 1958. The plenary meeting of the central committee and the session of the Supreme Soviet have taken important decisions whose implementation will ensure the further advance of all branches of the national economy, the raising of cultural and living standards, and will promote the creative initiative and activity of the working people at large.

We welcome the approaching new year entirely hopeful that it will bring the Soviet people—the people of builders and creators—new successes in building a communist society.

We shall do everything to make the coming year of 1958 a year of peace, a year in which the "cold war" will subside or be completely abolished, so that the people can live without any worry for their future, for the future of their children, wives and mothers, so that competition between the two systems

may develop peacefully on the basis of economic and cultural advancement and fuller satisfaction of man's material and spiritual needs.

The Soviet people are engaged in peaceful labour. They will resolutely strive to fulfil the plans adopted at the session, to strengthen the might of the Soviet state, to raise the living standards of the working people, aware that all this tends to strengthen the cause of peace.

Let us wish all Soviet people success in their creative labour for the good of our great socialist homeland. Let us wish every Soviet family, every citizen of the Soviet Union a Happy New Year!

Glory to the great Soviet people—the builders of communism—and to their tried and tested leader—the Communist Party of the Soviet Union!

Under the leadership of the Communist Party and under the banner of Marxism-Leninism—forward to communism!

encouragement of international trade, and certain other questions which concern a large number of countries which belong to neither of the groupings, the Soviet government considers it advisable that such countries as, for instance, India, Afghanistan, Egypt, Yugoslavia, Sweden, and Austria should take part in the conference. Participation in the conference by countries not bound by military commitments to either of the groupings could play only a positive role, for it is beyond doubt that countries which have proclaimed their political non-participation in military blocs, countries which have proved their allegiance to the cause of peace and international co-operation, could exert a beneficial influence on the adoption of decisions which would help to strengthen peace.

Finally, a situation could be allowed whereby there would take part in the talks, at least in the initial stage, two or three countries from each of the aforementioned groupings, or even one country from each, providing the necessary agreement is reached on this point.

In the Soviet government's view the conference could be held, by agreement with the Swiss government, in Geneva.

As for the proposal for convening a conference at the Foreign Ministers' level, there is no confidence that such talks would lead to positive results. Furthermore, pronouncements by certain statesmen, opposing the very idea of East-West talks, indicate that at the present time talks at such a level would meet with serious difficulties, creating further

obstacles to convening a conference of heads of government.

The Soviet government believes that the ending of the "cold war," the ending of the arms race, the establishment of the necessary confidence in relations between states, the creation of conditions for firm and lasting peace—all this could best be achieved at a conference in which the heads of government take a direct part. It goes without saying that later it would be advisable to hold a Foreign Ministers' conference to discuss further, on the basis of the agreement already reached, the appropriate questions, and to prepare the necessary agreements.

The Soviet Union is doing its utmost to help to strengthen peace and establish confidence among the peoples. During the last few years it has unilaterally carried out reductions in its armed forces of almost two million men. In fulfilment of the resolution of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet of December 21, 1957, providing for further measures to reduce the armed forces of the Soviet Union, the Soviet government has already taken a decision to carry out an additional reduction of the Soviet armed forces by a further 300,000 men, including more than 41,000 Soviet troops stationed in the German Democratic Republic, and more than 17,000 stationed in Hungary.

The Soviet government expresses the hope that the United States, the United Kingdom and France will, in their turn, take steps to reduce their armed forces, thus contributing to the establishment of genuine international security, to the strengthening of world peace.

January 8, 1958

Supplement

N. A. BULGANIN'S LETTER TO Mr. MACMILLAN and SOVIET GOVERNMENT PROPOSALS JAN. 8 1958

N. A. BULGANIN'S LETTER

DEAR PRIME MINISTER,

In my recent letter to you I was able to inform you of the Soviet government's views on the dangerous development of world events from the standpoint of peace, and I was able to set out certain proposals, which, we are convinced, if carried out, would help to ease international tension, to create an atmosphere of confidence in relations between states, and to assist in the solution by peaceful means of outstanding international problems. As you will recall, the Soviet government called for the holding, at a high level, of talks by statesmen on urgent international problems.

May I recall that, since my message to you, the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet—in its resolution of December 21, 1957, sent to the British parliament and government—has expressed the hope that the parliaments and governments of all countries will examine these proposals of the Soviet government with due attention.

We are justified in expressing satisfaction that our proposals have evoked a wide response in many countries. Judging by their own statements, the participants in the Paris meeting of the N.A.T.O. Council also discussed the Soviet Union's proposals. We welcome the speeches of those statesmen at the N.A.T.O. Council meeting in Paris who expressed support for the idea of summit

talks, for, in our view, this road of peaceful settlement is the only possible road for the peoples to safeguard their future.

Of course, the Soviet government is favourably disposed towards those statements in the declaration issued by the N.A.T.O. Council meeting which express the readiness of the countries belonging to that alliance "to settle international problems by negotiation," in order "to lay a solid foundation for a durable peace." All the same, I should also like to point out frankly that the declarations of peaceable aims by the N.A.T.O. members are not, in our opinion, in accord with those decisions of the December meeting of the N.A.T.O. Council which were directed towards continuing the "cold war" policy and intensifying the arms race. This is precisely what is meant, in particular, by the decisions to put ballistic missiles at the disposal of the Supreme Commander-in-Chief of the N.A.T.O. armed forces and to establish stockpiles of nuclear warheads, atom bases and rocket-launching sites on the territories of West European countries.

A glance at the situation that is emerging in Europe is enough to show that attempts are being made to turn the territories of the N.A.T.O. member-countries into an area stocked with foreign nuclear and rocket weapons. How can one reconcile oneself to the

situation today in which American bombers, carrying atomic and hydrogen bombs, are all the time flying over the citizens of the N.A.T.O. member-countries? Furthermore, they now want to establish launching sites for rockets with atomic warheads. The Soviet people fully understand and sympathise with the peoples of those European countries who, more and more vigorously, are expressing their concern at this terrible business. Another reason why the Soviet Union is unable to regard this with indifference is because the flights of bombers carrying atomic and hydrogen bombs over European countries are actively directed against the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries. This is why we are especially sensitive to these dangerous, inhuman activities, which may bring about disaster for mankind.

Is there anyone who does not realise that the establishment of nuclear and rocket weapon bases on the territories of the N.A.T.O. member-countries has the aim of transforming these countries into the front line of a theatre of military activity, subjecting them to the first crushing blows dealt in retaliation for the action of an aggressor? Perhaps you may think these are sharp words, but I am convinced that they do not exaggerate, that they differ in no way from the many voices that are making themselves heard, more and more loudly, in many West European countries, voices which are filled with profound anxiety for peace on the European continent, for the fate of many, many millions of men and women.

It is impossible to fail to see, behind the desire to force the deployment of nuclear and rocket weapons on certain European countries, attempts to bring about a situation in which, in the event of armed conflict, the stockpiles of nuclear weapons would be used primarily in Europe, at the spot where the main military groupings of countries confront one another—as far away as possible from the territory of the probable main culprit in the unleashing of atomic war. It is, therefore, not surprising that the British

government's decision to build several bases in the North of the country for launching American rocket weapons has aroused such a sharp reaction from the population of such cities as Glasgow, Edinburgh and Aberdeen.

As we know, science and technique can today ensure the construction of a hydrogen bomb equal in explosive power to five, ten or more million tons of T.N.T. Let me, Mr. Prime Minister, ask one question: What, in the event of a tragic development of events in Europe, would the explosion of even one hydrogen bomb on the territory of any West European country signify? You know as well as we do that such an explosion would mean the destruction of every living thing within a radius of hundreds of kilometres, not to mention the colossal material devastation. It is easy to see what conclusions must be drawn by anyone who displays, not an apparent, but a genuine concern for the fate of the world. It appears to us that the statesmen of all countries, and not least the West European countries with their relatively small territories and great concentrations of populations and material resources, cannot help displaying the most profound disquiet over the path on to which the peoples are being driven by the policy of military preparations, continuation of the "cold war" and the ever-growing rivalry between the powers in the production of increasingly dangerous types of modern weapons.

Some people might be found who are inclined to interpret these words of mine as an attempt to threaten or frighten someone. But as I wrote you on a previous occasion, taking into consideration the baneful consequences of the arms race, the increasing production of nuclear weapons and the deployment of these weapons on the territories of other countries, we follow only one aim—to say what we think about the danger of unleashing atomic war, what is today known to anyone who is familiar with the facts, with the development of military technique. Nor shall I conceal my conviction that the greater the number of people who know these facts, the more difficult will it be for those who

continue to gamble with the fate of the world.

I do not want to start a controversy with you regarding the position taken up by the western powers at the December meeting of the N.A.T.O. Council. But circumstances do not permit me to ignore this subject completely. In your speech in the House of Commons on December 20, you declared that the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union had a common interest—to avoid war. We can only welcome such statements. But the legitimate question arises: How can the achievement of this high purpose be ensured, when the western powers—as the proceedings of the recent N.A.T.O. Council meeting confirm—are unwilling to renounce the line of continuing the "cold war," when they continue to gamble on the arms race, clinging to the compromised "policy of strength."

I believe that even if you do not share this view, you will agree with me that there is increasing anxiety today over the direction in which the development of events is leading, bearing in mind that the arms race has reached gigantic proportions. Everywhere, the peoples long for relaxation in the relations between states; they are demanding more and more insistently of their governments that they reach agreement with one another and that an end be put to the atmosphere of mutual suspicion, threats and intensified military preparations which bring mankind to the brink of war.

Can it be said that the N.A.T.O. member-states are acting in the direction of ending "the cold war" and the arms race? Unfortunately this cannot be said at all. Is it not a fact that, as soon as a certain easing of international tension is observed as a result of any particular favourable circumstances, artificial methods are resorted to in order to prevent such an easing, to electrify the situation once again, to frighten the taxpayer, and meanwhile to inflate military budgets still more and intensify war preparations? It also seems to us that precisely this is the object of the appearance recently of all kinds of secret documents, such as the "Gaither

Report," in which the policy of the arms race and further increases in the burden of taxation are praised in every way. The advocates of the arms race continue to declare that it is the only way to maintain the level of production and the necessary employment of the population.

We have, Mr. Prime Minister, expressed our view on this point many times. The arms race and the "cold war" lead, not to economic prosperity but, in the long run, to economic disaster, and it makes no difference that the disaster has not yet fallen today. We have always advocated—and still do—economic development on a healthy basis, economic development which would have as its purpose the output of commodities to satisfy the needs of the peoples, and a wide international exchange of consumer goods. It is well known that this view of ours coincides with the view of influential business circles in the West, including British business circles, who are becoming increasingly convinced that Britain's economic salvation lies, not in the arms race, but in her peaceful development and in broad economic ties with other states. I do not think this is any exaggeration—if one examines things soberly, instead of being guided by the slogan of "Guns before butter," a slogan which earned itself such ill repute in the not very distant past.

I would not be saying all that should be said, Mr. Prime Minister, about the danger of the present political line which N.A.T.O. member-states are following, if I failed to draw your attention to one more circumstance. For is it not a fact that recently the most zealous apologists for the cold war and the policy of strength have been calling openly for a so-called preventive war, openly advocating the advantage of striking the first atomic blow? Of course, these plans do not sparkle with novelty, but this in no way alters their dangerous, and—let me say outright—provocative character. It is not so long since Goebbels' department advocated the need for preventive war against the Soviet Union, and the Hitler High Command did unleash aggressive war against the Soviet Union.

We well know how that ended, however.

Can all this be disregarded? In our opinion it cannot, if there is to be a genuine effort to ease world tension and end the "cold war." This is all the more true since a fateful step, that might be taken by any individual country, may—by force of the commitments by which that country is bound up with other countries—result in incalculable disaster for many peoples, and give rise to a worldwide military conflagration. Looking facts in the face, the question today stands like this: Either the government leaders meet round one table to map out the ways of easing world tension and settling the outstanding issues which are causing anxiety in the world, or else the danger of atomic war, with all its terrible consequences, will continue to grow.

The calls for talks, we gather, are also meeting with wide support in Britain, where the representatives of the most varied circles express themselves in favour of reaching agreement, for instance, to carry out such measures as the immediate ending of nuclear weapon tests or the creation of a zone in the centre of Europe free from atomic and rocket weapons. However, the voices of some western leaders, particularly in the United States, are reaching us, opposing talks with the Soviet Union. And they resort to the well-known pretext which has been used so many times by opponents of international co-operation, namely, they say that the Soviet Union cannot be trusted, for it does not, they allege, carry out its international obligations. Piling one ridiculous assertion on top of another, they try, in particular, to present matters as though the Soviet government had violated the decisions of the Geneva four-power heads of government conference, on ways for German reunification.

But you, Mr. Prime Minister, as a participant in that conference, are well aware that no such decision was taken, and that only a directive was issued to the Foreign Ministers for future talks. And if we are to speak of fulfilment of the Geneva conference decisions, it has regretfully to be recorded that the policy of certain western powers since the

Geneva conference has not been in keeping with the desire expressed in those directives, to help in the easing of world tension and to renounce the use of force.

The legitimate question arises: What other road for the settlement of international problems is suggested by the opponents of negotiations? The other road is the continuation of the arms race, continuation of the "cold war," which is not even concealed, as a matter of fact. But where does this road lead? In my opinion, there is only one conclusion that can be drawn: This road leads not to the settlement of outstanding international problems but, on the contrary, to the exacerbation of the international situation, to the sharpening of mistrust between the powers, to the intensification of the "cold war" and thereby to a growing danger that it will develop into "hot war."

As in the past, there are people to be found who try to represent the steps we have taken towards strengthening peace as though the Soviet government, in making any particular proposals, is pursuing only propaganda aims, and that what is needed for the settlement of international problems is not words but deeds. We note with regret that such assertions can also be heard from the lips of British leaders. But let me say frankly, only people who wish to slander our country and, in fact, to avoid negotiations, can talk in that way.

The British government is aware of actions by the Soviet Union which have greatly helped in the easing of the international situation, such as the signing of the Austrian State Treaty; the regularisation of relations with Yugoslavia; the consistent struggle to end the wars in Korea and Indo-China; assistance in the ending of military operations in Egypt, and in preventing a dangerous development of events around Syria. It is also known, for instance, that the Soviet Union—after reason had gained the upper hand over dangerous calculations threatening peace—cancelled measures that had been taken during the recent serious aggravation of the situation around Syria. No one compelled the Soviet Union to do this—nor could they—and in doing this we were guided ex-

clusively by the desire to remove the dangerous situation which arises from time to time in the Middle East area, through no fault of the Soviet Union's.

The Soviet Union dismantled its military bases in Port Arthur and Porkkala-Udd, and has recently reduced its armed forces by nearly two million, including a cut in the strength of its troops stationed in the German Democratic Republic by more than 50,000. Now, carrying out the resolution passed by the session of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet on December 21, 1957, we are making another cut in our armed forces, of 300,000 men, including a cut of more than 41,000 men stationed in the German Democratic Republic and over 17,000 stationed in Hungary.

If other western countries were to take similar steps, it would be a great contribution to making a start towards ending the "cold war" and solving other outstanding problems with a view to arriving at a radical settlement of the question of the reduction of the armed forces of all countries and of total disarmament.

What other deeds are expected from the Soviet Union? Can it be that certain western leaders think that the Soviet people should renounce their social system, give up their great achievements accomplished during the years of the Soviet state's existence?

As I have already written to you previously, we attach great importance to personal contacts between leading statesmen, to meetings which could clear the road for the settlement of urgent questions and pave the way for reaching agreement on other questions, more complicated or not sufficiently ripe for settlement. Life itself demands that talks be conducted at no lower than the highest level.

I could not but subscribe to your statement in the House of Commons, in which you also expressed readiness for talks in order to achieve concrete results. More or less similar statements have been made recently by other leaders of N.A.T.O. member-countries. It appears to me, Mr. Prime Minister, that since there is a mutual desire for talks,

why should we not discuss, in a calm atmosphere around the conference table, with the participation of the leading statesmen, the most urgent questions, so as to bring the positions of the powers closer together? It appears to us that the need for this is becoming increasingly evident.

True, certain official personalities in the West, and even in Britain itself, are forecasting failure for a conference of leading statesmen. And the way it is being presented is that such a conference calls for lengthy preparation, for a preliminary conference of Foreign Ministers, for instance.

In this connection, attention must be paid to legitimate fears that those who are against a conference of the heads of government might be preparing to show only a false semblance of readiness to meet the demands of the peoples for negotiations. Might they not want to begin negotiations with the Soviet Union only so as to try, at the conference of Foreign Ministers, to condemn to failure all efforts to reach agreement, by imposing their own conditions on the other side and by a refusal to conduct talks on the basis of paying heed to the legitimate interests of all the participants in the negotiations? Might they not, in the same way, think to compromise the very idea of negotiations between states and to close the road to a summit conference? If the preconceived attitude on the question of negotiations of some Ministers in countries which belong to N.A.T.O.—Ministers who never tire of asserting that such negotiations do not give results—is taken into consideration, then it becomes obvious why these apprehensions arise.

Recently it has become fashionable in certain circles in the West to minimise in every way the significance of the Geneva conference of 1955. They say that this conference did not make any concrete contribution to peace. It is not difficult to see the groundless nature of these assertions, if one remembers how relieved the peoples of every country felt after Geneva.

It would be an illusion to think that only the Soviet Union is interested in

negotiations. However, in some countries the matter is presented just like that, and the falsity of such assertions strikes the eye. For it is a fact that people who can never be suspected of goodwill towards the Soviet Union—people like the well-known American diplomat, Mr. Kennan, and also such eminent British public figures and representatives of intellectual circles as Mr. Bevan, Mr. Cousins, Bertrand Russell and Mr. Priestley, speak in favour of negotiations between the West and the East.

There are arguments that negotiations with the Soviet Union, and the countries of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, are not timely, since the Soviet Union, having launched sputniks and having disclosed that it has intercontinental missiles, has obtained an advantage over the western powers and intends to conduct negotiations from "a position of strength." Therefore, they say, there is no need to be in a hurry for negotiations, but first of all it is necessary to catch up, to overtake the Soviet Union in the scientific, technical and military fields, and only then sit at the conference table. We should like to make it clear to the peoples of the West that the Soviet Union has not had recourse to, and is not preparing to have recourse to the "policy of strength," and that such an attitude, as you know, is not a product of our foreign policy.

The Soviet Union was not weak, when earlier, long before the launching of the sputniks, it stood consistently for negotiations and not only suggested concrete measures of disarmament, but even reduced its own armed forces unilaterally. When we met the leading statesmen of the British government—Mr. Eden, yourself and Mr. Lloyd—in London in the spring of 1956, we spoke of the existence of rocket weapons in the Soviet Union. However, even then we stood for negotiations, for disarmament, for the ending of the cold war. If each side will give its agreement to participating in international negotiations only when it considers itself to be stronger than its partners, then it must be admitted that the arms race will continue and

negotiations will be postponed indefinitely.

In our opinion, during the next two or three months a conference of the leading statesmen of the countries belonging to the North Atlantic Alliance and the states participating in the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, and similarly a number of countries not included in these two groupings, should be called. I enclose with this letter the Soviet government's concrete proposals on the calling of such a conference and on the questions, which should, in our opinion, be discussed at it.

Of course, a different approach to negotiations may be taken. There could be put forward for discussion questions on which it would quite obviously be impossible to obtain agreement. I have in mind, for example, questions on which the differences of opinion result from the differences in the systems of the socialist and capitalist states, and from different ideological beliefs. When we enter into negotiations, our opinion is that attention should be paid, not to those questions on which it is known beforehand that agreement cannot be reached, but to those on which it is possible to reach understanding, on a mutually acceptable basis, on the basis of recognition of the principles of peaceful co-existence—principles which have already received wide international support.

In reality, can the discussion of such questions as, for example, the so-called "problem of the East European countries" or of the German question, be of any use? You know very well that when certain people in the West talk about the East European countries in this connection, they do not conceal their hostility to the socialist social structure in the people's democracies, and do not conceal their desire to see other régimes in those countries. But it is obvious to everyone with any commonsense that a person who holds such views is not striving for peaceful co-existence, but is adopting a warlike position. I think that it is hardly necessary to say anything more on that matter.

We know that you, Mr. Prime Minister, show a lively interest in the solution of the German problem. In the Soviet Union there is a sympathetic attitude towards the desire of the German people to be reunited in one state. But how can this be achieved? Let us base ourselves on realities and start from the fact that two sovereign German states with different political structures have been in existence for a long time now; and let us recognise that only through agreement among the Germans themselves—taking into account the interests of the two German states—can the reunification of Germany be achieved.

We start from the fact that one of the most important problems is the problem of disarmament. You may ask: Why not continue examining this problem in one or other of the organs of U.N.O.? But the discussion of this problem in the Disarmament Commission and Sub-Committee, which lasted for eleven years, proved fruitless. In its desire to obtain practical results, the Soviet Union has on many occasions accepted the proposals of the western powers; but, unfortunately, our partners do not have a serious attitude towards the negotiations, and every time that their proposals are accepted by the Soviet side, they renounce them. That was the fate of the western powers' proposals on fixing the level of armed forces, on aerial photography, etc.

We finally lost faith in the possibility of an agreement on questions of disarmament being reached in these U.N.O. bodies when, at the last session of the General Assembly, a resolution was imposed in which all those proposals of the western powers, which have not furthered by one step the cause of disarmament and which had previously led the negotiations into a blind alley, were put forward as a kind of platform for further negotiations on disarmament. Disturbed by the hopelessness of further work in the Disarmament Sub-Committee as formerly composed, the Soviet Union proposed that the negotiations on disarmament be transferred to a broad, representative body, in which all U.N.

member-countries would participate. But this was not accepted. Neither did the Soviet Union's other proposals for the calling of a special session of the General Assembly, or for an international conference to examine the question of disarmament, meet with support from the western powers. Albania's proposal, which was backed by the Soviet Union, for the setting up of a U.N.O. disarmament body, at least half of which would consist of socialist states and of neutral countries which have demonstrated their devotion to peace, was also rejected through the efforts of those same powers.

I will not hide from you, Mr. Prime Minister, that we are very disappointed at the way in which this question was discussed at the last session of the General Assembly, for we are convinced that acceptance of the forms of discussing disarmament problems which we have suggested would breathe new life into these negotiations. We are seriously concerned at the situation which has grown up in the United Nations, whereby one state or group of states imposes its own resolutions on others, without heeding their opinions, and against their legitimate interests. We consider that it cannot be permitted that the General Assembly should go about deciding these questions in a way not proper for this international body, which is called upon to help in every possible way to bring together the different points of view of the sovereign states, as is provided for in the U.N. Charter.

Bearing in mind that negotiations on questions of disarmament have now come to a halt, and that at present there are no conditions for raising them again in the United Nations Organisation, we suggest that a meeting of leading statesmen—a meeting the calling of which we support—could usefully discuss at least the most urgent problems of disarmament, such as the immediate halting, for at least two or three years, of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests and a renunciation by the governments of the U.S.S.R., Britain and the U.S.A. of the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

At this conference, in our opinion, the proposal of the Polish People's

Republic on the creation, in the central part of Europe, of a zone free from atomic weapons, the question of the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between states belonging to the North Atlantic Alliance and the states which participate in the Warsaw Treaty, and certain other questions should similarly be discussed.

My colleagues and I welcome, Mr. Prime Minister, your statement of January 4, supporting the idea of the conclusion of a solemn pact of non-aggression between certain countries. The Soviet Union has many times previously suggested that such a pact of non-aggression between states belonging to the North Atlantic Alliance and states participating in the Warsaw Treaty should be concluded in the interests of ensuring security in Europe. We therefore learnt with particular satisfaction of the statement on your favourable attitude to this, which obviously makes the prospects of understanding on this question much more hopeful.

We are convinced that the reaching of an understanding on these questions which the Soviet government proposes should be discussed at the conference, or on some of them, would create a favourable basis so that, at the next stage, an examination may be made of those important questions which, clearly, are not yet ripe for solution at present—questions such as the reduction of armed forces, the complete prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons and their removal from the armaments of states, the withdrawal of all foreign troops stationed in other countries, including Germany, the elimination of

foreign military bases and the establishment of collective security in Europe.

If the other participants in a summit conference express their readiness for negotiations and a solution to the problem of radical measures for disarmament, including a substantial reduction of the countries' armed forces—then the Soviet Union, as it has often stated, is ready to take part in this and to direct all its efforts to reaching a settlement of these questions, even in the first stage in the negotiations.

With regard to participation in the conference, our ideas on this question are put forward in the proposals of the Soviet government enclosed with my letter. We believe that if the governments express a real desire to conduct negotiations among leading statesmen, it will scarcely be difficult to reach an understanding on who is to take part in the conference, or on other questions connected with holding the conference.

I should like to express my firm belief, Mr. Prime Minister, that the government of the United Kingdom—a power which possesses nuclear weapons and which, together with the other great powers, bears a special responsibility for the fate of the world—will respond favourably to the proposal we put forward on the calling of a conference and on the tasks of that conference, and that it will inform us of its own ideas on this question.

With sincere respect,
N. BULGANIN

January 8, 1958.

SOVIET PROPOSALS: A Document sent to the Governments of U.N.O. and N.A.T.O. countries and Switzerland.

THE present international situation is marked, on the one hand, by the continuation of the "cold war," intensification of the armaments race, particularly in the production of atomic and hydrogen weapons, and a direct danger to world peace, to the fate of the whole of mankind. On the other hand, it is marked by a gigantic growth of the forces demanding peace and security. The peoples are calling with increasing determination for the "cold war" to be ended, for a halt to the frantic arms race, for mankind to be freed from the danger of war so that, at long last, men and women may be enabled to rid themselves of fear for their lives and for the future of their children.

Today, for the statesmen, the government leaders who bear the primary responsibility for the policies of their countries, there is and can be no more urgent or noble task than that of establishing lasting peace and removing the danger of atomic war that is looming over mankind.

Gravely concerned over the situation that has arisen in the world, and desirous of doing everything in its power to lay the foundation for a radical improvement in the international situation, the Soviet government recently made a number of proposals to the governments of the member-countries of the North Atlantic Alliance (N.A.T.O.), and also to the governments of all the other member-states of the United Nations Organisation—proposals aimed at achieving, by joint efforts, a relaxation in international tension, at creating the necessary atmosphere of trust in relations between states. At its recent session in December, 1957, the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet passed a resolution which likewise puts forward definite proposals aimed at reducing international tension, at putting an end to the "cold war," and calling on the parliaments and governments of all countries to take the necessary steps to prevent events from developing along dangerous lines, to defend peace and rid

mankind of the nightmare of an atomic war of annihilation.

One cannot fail to point out that after making a sober appraisal of the international situation, many governments, eminent statesmen, political and public figures, and representatives of broad public circles with different social positions and different political views and religious beliefs, are more and more insistently demanding that an end be put to the arms race and that the road to war be barred.

It is becoming increasingly clear to all that the issue today is:

Either the "cold war" continues, in which case mankind is faced with the danger of it developing into "hot war";

Or else the principles of the peaceful co-existence of states receive universal recognition. In this case there will be opened up for mankind the prospect of the peaceful development of the peoples along the path of spiritual and material progress.

The Soviet government is pleased to note that the principles of the peaceful co-existence of states have already won international recognition on a wide scale. They met with unanimous recognition and approval at the 12th General Assembly of the United Nations, which passed a special resolution on this most important question. In this way, the United Nations member-states recognised that the basis of relations between them, irrespective of their social systems, must be the principles of mutual respect and mutual benefit, non-aggression, mutual respect for sovereignty, equality and territorial integrity, and non-interference in one another's internal affairs. The Soviet government welcomes the General Assembly's appeal to all states to do their utmost to strengthen world peace and develop friendly relations and co-operation, and to use only peaceful means to settle all outstanding issues.

Today statesmen and political leaders

cannot ignore the peoples' irrepressible desire for peace.

As is well known, even the documents of the recent session of the N.A.T.O. Council have a great deal to say about peace; they say that the organisation "will never be used for aggressive purposes," and that its member-countries "are always ready to settle international problems by negotiation, taking into account the legitimate interests of all." If that is so, if the western powers, and in the first place the United States, adhere to these principles in their relations with other countries, then there is no obstacle to appropriate agreements being reached by means of negotiation in the interests of peace.

The Soviet government fully shares the view of a number of governments and also the ever-increasing demand of broad international public circles that a summit conference of statesmen would be helpful in removing the danger of a new war. Such a conference could find effective ways for settling the problems which are profoundly disturbing all peoples, and for bringing about the necessary turn in the development of international relations. Experience shows that unless there are personal meetings between the leading statesmen who bear the primary responsibility for the policies of their countries, it is difficult to count on mutually acceptable decisions being reached on pressing international problems, especially in view of the acute and complicated character of these problems.

Naturally, the point at issue is not that of the fundamental differences between existing social systems, the differences between socialism and capitalism, the ideological differences between states. Such questions are the domestic concern of each country, and cannot form the subject of international negotiations. What is being dealt with is the pressing international problems which can and should be solved by means of negotiations between the states, taking into account their mutual interests.

The Soviet government bears in mind

the fact that it would, of course, be difficult at such a conference of government leaders to reach agreement on all these questions. The attention of such a conference should be focused primarily on the most urgent questions, whose settlement would lay the basis for an improvement in the whole international situation. Examination of other problems could be referred to a subsequent stage in negotiations between the states. There can be no doubt that if agreement is reached first of all on a few individual questions, this would be conducive to the settlement of other outstanding international problems as well. Such a method of gradually solving the outstanding problems that face the states at the present time, when the necessary confidence in relations between states is still lacking, appears to be the most realistic and most justified method.

Guided by the aim of strengthening world peace, taking into account the broad movement of the people in favour of talks between the statesmen of East and West, and also taking into consideration the statement of the participants in the Paris session of the N.A.T.O. Council on their readiness to solve international problems by means of negotiation, the Soviet government proposes that during the next two or three months of this year a summit conference be held of leaders of states, with the participation of the heads of government. At the conference they could first of all discuss problems whose settlement would meet the aspirations of the peoples and would serve as an important beginning for a radical change in the international situation and the ending of the "cold war."

1. At the conference the proposal for an immediate ending, at least for a period of two or three years, of hydrogen and atomic weapon tests should be considered. The need for such a step is evident. The cessation of the test explosions of hydrogen and atom bombs would stop the development of prototypes of ever more destructive and deadly weapons.

At the same time an agreement on

this matter would demonstrate the determination of the powers to take definite steps to end the race in atomic weapons and to reduce the danger of an atomic war. The usefulness of an immediate examination of this problem is also underlined by the fact that the majority of states, including all powers which possess nuclear weapons, recognise the necessity of reaching an agreement on the ending of nuclear weapon tests. The conclusion of such an agreement is made easier by the fact that it would not require any measures of control that are complicated and hard to achieve, and would do no harm to any of the states.

Naturally, the conference would also provide an opportunity for exchanging views on certain other aspects of the disarmament problem, especially since the disarmament talks have been suspended at the present time and the conditions for resuming them in the United Nations agencies are as yet lacking.

2. The task of banning atomic and hydrogen weapons, which are weapons of mass destruction whose use cannot be reconciled with the conscience of civilised mankind, is becoming increasingly urgent. The Soviet government, for its part, invariably strives to reach agreement with the governments of the United States and the United Kingdom on renunciation of the use of these weapons. A pledge to this effect given by all the powers possessing atomic and hydrogen weapons would be of the utmost importance for establishing confidence in relations between the states and for ridding the peoples of the fear of atomic war. This measure, too, is entirely feasible, since it requires neither the establishment of any form of control nor any material outlay. The viability and practicability of such an agreement have already been proved by historical examples in which similar agreements concerning other weapons of mass destruction (chemical and bacteriological weapons, and others) have played no small part in the struggle of the peoples against aggressors.

3. The proposal by the government of the Polish People's Republic to

create a zone free from atomic weapons in Central Europe is attracting the attention of many governments and wide public circles, particularly in Europe. By this proposal, as we know, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany would prohibit the deployment of all types of atomic or hydrogen weapons on their territories and renounce the manufacture of these weapons.

Establishment of such a zone would remove from the sphere of atomic war preparations an area in Central Europe covering about a million square kilometres, with a population of over 100 million. It can scarcely be doubted that the carrying out of this measure would not only remove the threat of atomic war from these countries, situated as they are in the area in which the two main opposing military groupings meet, but would also be received with relief by the peoples of other countries, for it would be an important landmark on the road to the total prohibition of atomic weapons and their removal from the armaments of the states.

It would thus be a big step in solving the great task of using atomic energy for peaceful purposes exclusively, for improving the wellbeing of men and women, for the further development of science and culture, making it possible to extend still further the boundaries of knowledge of the laws of nature and their employment for the good of mankind.

As is well known, the governments of Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic have already agreed to take part in such a zone. It is also known that the government of the Federal Republic of Germany, on signing the Paris agreements, undertook not to produce atomic weapons. The Soviet government has already declared its support for Poland's proposal and would be prepared, together with the governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and France, to assume corresponding commitments concerning a zone free from atomic weapons and do all in its power, for its part, to help

1 386,000 square miles approx.

reach agreement among the states on this question.

All this goes to show that at the present time there exist the necessary prerequisites for making the proposal that a zone free from atomic weapons be established in Central Europe, even though it consists initially of only four countries, the subject of urgent consideration at a conference of leading statesmen.

4. It would be in keeping with the interests of ending the "cold war" and the arms race for the conference to examine the question of a non-aggression treaty, to be concluded, in one form or another, between the member-states of the North Atlantic Alliance and the Warsaw Treaty member-states. Like all the other parties to the Warsaw Treaty, the Soviet Union, bearing in mind the great significance of such a step, has repeatedly declared its readiness to conclude such a multilateral agreement. The Soviet government also proceeds from the view that neither agreement on this question, nor, especially, absence of agreement on it, in any way precludes the possibility of non-aggression pacts being concluded on a bilateral basis between individual members of these groupings, for which the Soviet Union expresses its readiness, since this, too, is fully in keeping with the need to lessen international tension and the need to strengthen peace.

The declaration adopted at the December session of the N.A.T.O. Council in Paris states that that organisation will not be used for aggressive purposes. Judging by this statement, the idea of a non-aggression agreement between the two military groupings should meet with no objection on the part of the member-states of the North Atlantic Alliance. The conclusion of such an agreement, or of similar agreements between individual countries, would have a tremendously favourable effect on the international situation and would exercise a great restraining influence on any possible aggressor who, if he were to unleash aggressive war, would find himself in a position of international

isolation, with all the ensuing consequences.

5. It can scarcely be denied that a reduction in the foreign military forces stationed in Germany, and also in the other member-countries of both the North Atlantic Alliance and the Warsaw Treaty, and all the more so, the complete withdrawal of these forces, would be of tremendously great political importance for making healthier the situation in Europe, and not only in Europe. Bearing in mind that agreement on the complete withdrawal of foreign troops from these countries, as experience has shown, is meeting with serious difficulties, the need arises, in the Soviet government's view, for agreement to be reached between the interested states at least concerning a reduction in the strength of their forces on these territories, or on the territory of Germany as a beginning. Agreement on this question, particularly since it concerns an area situated in the heart of Europe, would be of great stabilising importance. Not only would it help in settling other questions on which there are at present differences among the powers, but it could also help to create conditions favouring a *rapprochement* of the two German states—the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany.

6. One should not regard as exhausted the possibilities of an agreement on the questions connected with the prevention of a surprise attack and on the related questions of control as applicable to the nature of steps in the field of disarmament, on which an agreement could be reached in the near future provided that the countries concerned so desire. In this connection there arises a need to discuss the following measures:

(a) Bearing in mind the understandable desire of every state to safeguard itself against sudden attack, it would be important to take steps to prevent any secret concentration of troops or military equipment which might be used to prepare such a sudden attack. This purpose would be served by the establishment of control posts at railway junc-

tions, in big ports and on main motor roads. The advisability of this measure, as we know, is also admitted by other countries which took part in the disarmament talks, and this indicates that there should be no special difficulty in reaching agreement on this question.

(b) Bearing in mind the importance attached by certain governments to aerial photographic inspection of the territories of states, it is proposed that agreement be reached on establishing an 800-kilometre² zone of aerial photography on either side of a line dividing the opposing military groupings in Europe, since in this area, at a relatively small distance from one another, are concentrated big armed forces of the N.A.T.O. member-states and the Warsaw Treaty member-states, and this in itself is fraught with great danger, especially for the situation in Europe. In view of the fact that on the territory of Germany there is a concentration of armed forces and military equipment abnormally large for peacetime, and in view of the fact that the main military groupings of states directly confront one another there, it appears advisable that agreement be reached between the appropriate states, including the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany, concerning the implementation on German territory of wider forms of supervision over the measures on which there is a possibility of reaching agreement already at the present time. Such measures could be concerned, for instance, with a reduction in the strength of foreign forces on the territory of both parts of Germany, and subsequently with the complete withdrawal of these forces from Germany and also, by agreement between the states concerned, with an atom-free zone.

The Soviet government proceeds from the premise that the functions and scope of control, taking as our guide, not considerations of propaganda, but the real situation, are directly dependent on the state of relations between the states and the nature and significance of the disarmament measures being carried out.

² Nearly 500 miles.

This means that the functions and scope of control, and also inspection, must be regarded in close connection with the realisation of steps to lessen tension in international relations and to strengthen confidence among the states, and particularly the great powers. To the extent that agreement is reached on disarmament questions, including agreement on a substantial reduction in armed forces and armaments and on the total prohibition of nuclear weapons, the ending of their manufacture, their withdrawal from the armaments of the states, and destruction of the stockpiles of these weapons, the obstacles to the extension of control and inspection will disappear. At the appropriate stage the Soviet government, for its part, will be prepared to regard such an extension with favour.

7. It would also be advisable for the conference to consider the question of possible measures for expanding international trade ties, which are the natural and most reliable basis for developing measures for peaceful relations among the states. The aim should be to create a situation in which the development of international trade is not impeded by artificially created legal obstacles whereby many countries are placed in an inequitable position as compared with other states. This, in turn, would help to develop broad exchanges and peaceful competition between the countries in the field of scientific thought, in the field of technical progress and the organisation of production processes. The strengthening of economic ties between the states would create a favourable basis for establishing genuine trust between them, and would thereby create the necessary conditions for improving political relations.

No one can deny the indisputable fact that the rupture in normal economic relations between many countries is a product of the "cold war" and the establishment of opposed military groupings. Hence it follows that it is impossible to talk of ending the "cold war" and lessening tension in relations between states without putting an end to the abnormal situation that has arisen in international trade.

8. Although the United Nations Organisation, as far back as ten years ago, unanimously condemned war propaganda, in some western countries such propaganda continues to this day, and not only does it not abate, but it is assuming even greater proportions. It is common knowledge that in certain western countries the calls for a so-called preventive war have recently increased, and the advantages of striking the first blow are openly being discussed. It is not difficult to imagine what the situation would be were similar calls to be made in those countries against which certain western leaders now call for the first blow to be struck. Where is the judge to be found who can decide where to draw the line between the private opinion of individuals and an expression of the official attitude of any given government? It is sufficient to put this question for it to become clear that here is a case of playing with fire, to which an end must be put if we are to display, not pretended concern, but real concern for peace. Yet this propaganda for aggression, which in essence does not differ at all from the calls made by the Hitlerites in their day, meets with no rebuff in those countries, and many organs of the press readily offer their pages to spread this propaganda. All this is poisoning relations between the states; greatly intensifies suspicion in relations between them and thereby increases the danger of war.

In view of this, agreement should be reached at this conference regarding measures to put an end to the war propaganda which is being conducted in some countries at the present time. No statesman who is guided by a realisation of his responsibility for the fate of peace, and above all no government, can fail to raise their voice against such propaganda. It is impossible, at one and the same time, to talk of peace and yet not take measures against those who are calling for war.

9. A meeting of government leaders would provide the opportunity for exchanging views on ways for reducing tension in the Middle East and for attempting to reach agreement that the great powers will take no steps to violate

the independence of the countries of that area, renouncing the use of force in the settlement of questions concerning the Middle East. It goes without saying that examination of this question should have one aim—to remove all outside interference in the domestic affairs of the countries of that area and to help to strengthen the sovereignty and national independence of the Middle East countries.

In the view of the Soviet government, the solution of the problems enumerated above is not only timely, but urgent. At the conference it would also be possible to discuss other constructive proposals conducive to ending the "cold war," which might be submitted by other participants in the conference, and the need for examining those proposals could be agreed on by the participants in the conference; it would also be possible to reach agreement on the procedure for examining outstanding issues the settlement of which encounters certain difficulties at the present time in view of differences in the positions of the states. An agreement could be reached on which questions should be examined at a subsequent stage in the talks between the states, both at similar conferences and also within the framework of the United Nations.

It is well known, for instance, that the governments of the United States and the United Kingdom are at the present time unwilling to agree to the prohibition of nuclear weapons and to the withdrawal of those weapons from the armaments of the states, with the destruction of stockpiles; this, in turn, leads to a deadlock on the question of ending the production of fissile materials for military purposes. In such circumstances nothing remains but to defer questions connected with a radical solution to the problem of atomic disarmament to a later stage in the talks, when agreement has been reached on less complicated questions.

Nor, as official statements by the governments of the western powers indicate, can one anticipate, apparently, that the countries belonging to the North

Atlantic Alliance will at the present time agree to the proposals:

For a substantial reduction in armed forces and armaments and the conclusion of an appropriate international agreement for this purpose;

For the complete withdrawal of foreign armed forces from the territories of N.A.T.O. member-states and Warsaw Treaty member-states, and for the elimination of all foreign military bases;

For the replacement of the existing military groupings in Europe by a system of collective security.

At the present time there is little basis for believing that discussion of these questions by the conference would lead to positive results. Later, after measures agreed at the proposed conference have been carried out, and a certain minimum of the necessary international confidence has thereby been created, the appropriate conditions will emerge for carrying out more radical measures, including disarmament measures.

It goes without saying that all questions directly relating to the Chinese People's Republic can only be solved with its participation. The Soviet government deems it necessary once again to declare that the policy of preventing People's China from taking a direct part in the consideration of outstanding international problems is gravely detrimental to the international atmosphere as a whole and to the work of the United Nations.

The ending of the "cold war" and the extension of international co-operation would, undoubtedly, also facilitate a settlement of the German question on the basis of drawing the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany—two sovereign German states—closer together. The Soviet government is convinced that the sooner the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany find a mutually acceptable way to the peaceful restoration of Germany's national unity, the sooner will be accomplished the process of uniting in a single whole the two parts of Germany which are today developing

in different directions. As the Soviet government has already declared, it fully supports the German Democratic Republic's proposal for the establishment of a confederation of the two German states, as an important step towards the formation of a united, peace-loving and democratic Germany. Before we can talk of helping the unification of Germany from outside, it is necessary first of all to recognise the fact that two German states exist, and to respect the sovereignty of each of them. The Soviet Union will continue to try to facilitate the reaching of agreement between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany on the ways and means for the reunification of Germany. Such agreement would create the prerequisites for the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany.

At the present time, when it is necessary to take measures that will bring about a turn in the development of the international situation, what is needed in the interests of strengthening peace is the convening of a summit conference, with the participation of the heads of government. Bearing in mind the nature of the questions to be examined, it would be advisable for this conference to consist of representatives of all the member-states of the North Atlantic Alliance and the Warsaw Treaty member-states. In view of the fact that N.A.T.O. and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation comprise the main opposing military groupings and also the fact that all the countries belonging to these groupings are deeply concerned in the results of the talks, and above all in questions concerning the situation in Europe, it would be advisable not to deprive any of these states of the possibility of taking a direct part in examining the appropriate problems.

If, for some reason, difficulties should be encountered in agreeing on this basis for participation in the conference, the government of the U.S.S.R. would not object to a narrower composition for the conference.

In view of the fact that it is proposed that the conference should consider such questions as the disarmament problem, the ending of war propaganda,

encouragement of international trade, and certain other questions which concern a large number of countries which belong to neither of the groupings, the Soviet government considers it advisable that such countries as, for instance, India, Afghanistan, Egypt, Yugoslavia, Sweden, and Austria should take part in the conference. Participation in the conference by countries not bound by military commitments to either of the groupings could play only a positive role, for it is beyond doubt that countries which have proclaimed their political non-participation in military blocs, countries which have proved their allegiance to the cause of peace and international co-operation, could exert a beneficial influence on the adoption of decisions which would help to strengthen peace.

Finally, a situation could be allowed whereby there would take part in the talks, at least in the initial stage, two or three countries from each of the aforementioned groupings, or even one country from each, providing the necessary agreement is reached on this point.

In the Soviet government's view the conference could be held, by agreement with the Swiss government, in Geneva.

As for the proposal for convening a conference at the Foreign Ministers' level, there is no confidence that such talks would lead to positive results. Furthermore, pronouncements by certain statesmen, opposing the very idea of East-West talks, indicate that at the present time talks at such a level would meet with serious difficulties, creating further

obstacles to convening a conference of heads of government.

The Soviet government believes that the ending of the "cold war," the ending of the arms race, the establishment of the necessary confidence in relations between states, the creation of conditions for firm and lasting peace—all this could best be achieved at a conference in which the heads of government take a direct part. It goes without saying that later it would be advisable to hold a Foreign Ministers' conference to discuss further, on the basis of the agreement already reached, the appropriate questions, and to prepare the necessary agreements.

The Soviet Union is doing its utmost to help to strengthen peace and establish confidence among the peoples. During the last few years it has unilaterally carried out reductions in its armed forces of almost two million men. In fulfilment of the resolution of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet of December 21, 1957, providing for further measures to reduce the armed forces of the Soviet Union, the Soviet government has already taken a decision to carry out an additional reduction of the Soviet armed forces by a further 300,000 men, including more than 41,000 Soviet troops stationed in the German Democratic Republic, and more than 17,000 stationed in Hungary.

The Soviet government expresses the hope that the United States, the United Kingdom and France will, in their turn, take steps to reduce their armed forces, thus contributing to the establishment of genuine international security, to the strengthening of world peace.

January 8, 1958