

## Other sources of information on the Soviet Union . . . .

**SOVIET NEWS**—a daily Bulletin, free on request, published by the Soviet Embassy. Contains reports, speeches, documents, and interesting news items.

**SOVIET NEWS BOOKLETS**—are published at the rate of one or two per month and cover nearly every aspect of Soviet life. They vary in price from 2d. to 2/-, but an annual subscription of 5/- will bring them all to you, post free.

**SOVIET WEEKLY**—a bright illustrated magazine published every Thursday at 3d. It contains authentic well-written articles and up-to-date photographs on Soviet industry, agriculture, sport, education, stage and screen—and intelligent comment on international affairs.

**THE SOVIET UNION IN FACTS AND FIGURES**—This new book of 215 pages, lavishly illustrated, and with a large folded map, is the most useful volume on the Soviet Union yet available.

Plastic cover 5/-, Library edition 7/6d.  
Invaluable for home or school.

All the above (except SOVIET NEWS) will be found at many booksellers. All are available from

**SOVIET NEWS, 3 Rosary Gardens, London, S.W.7.**

# New Steps for Peace by Socialist Countries

Meeting of the Political Consultative  
Committee of the Warsaw Treaty  
Organisation 24 May 1958

- **Communique**
- **Declaration**
- **Speech by  
N. S. Khrushchov**
- **Appendix :**  
Communique of  
Conference of  
Representatives of  
Communist & Workers'  
Parties in Socialist  
Countries

**Soviet News  
Booklet No. 31**

**4<sup>D</sup>**

499

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>



# COMMUNIQUE

## on the Meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation

The following is the text of the communiqué issued after the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the states which are parties to the Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance :

A MEETING of the Political Consultative Committee of the states, parties to the Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance, was held in Moscow on May 24, 1958.

The following representatives attended the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee :

**From the People's Republic of Albania**—Mehmet Shehu, Chairman of the Council of Ministers; Enver Hodja, first secretary of the central committee of the Albanian Party of Labour; Behar Shtylla, Minister of Foreign Affairs; and Arif Hasko, Chief of the General Staff of the People's Army of the Albanian People's Republic.

**From the Bulgarian People's Republic**—Anton Yugov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers; Todor Zhivkov, first secretary of the central committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party; Karlo Lukanov, Minister of Foreign Affairs; and Pyotr Panchewski, Minister of National Defence.

**From the Hungarian People's Republic**—Janos Kadar, Minister of State and first secretary of the central committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party; Endre Sik, Minister of Foreign Affairs; and Colonel-General Geza Revesz, Minister of Defence.

**From the German Democratic Republic**—Otto Grotewohl, Chairman of the Council of Ministers; Walter Ulbricht, first secretary of the central committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany; Colonel-General Willi Stoph,

Minister of National Defence; Bruno Leuschner, Vice-Chairman of the Council of Ministers; and Otto Winzer, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs.

**From the Polish People's Republic**—Josef Cyrankiewicz, Chairman of the Council of Ministers; Wladislaw Gomulka, first secretary of the central committee of the Polish United Workers' Party; Adam Rapacki, Minister of Foreign Affairs; and Colonel-General Marian Spychalski, Minister of National Defence.

**From the Rumanian People's Republic**—Chivu Stoica, Chairman of the Council of Ministers; Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, first secretary of the central committee of the Rumanian Workers' Party; Emil Bodnaras, Vice-Chairman of the Council of Ministers; Avram Bunaciu, Minister of Foreign Affairs; and Colonel-General Leontin Salajan, Minister of the Armed Forces.

**From the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics**—N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers and first secretary of the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union; A. A. Gromyko, Minister of Foreign Affairs; Marshal of the Soviet Union R. Y. Malinovsky, Minister of Defence.

**From the Czechoslovak Republic**—Viliam Siroky, Prime Minister; Vaclav David, Minister of Foreign Affairs; and Colonel-General Bohumir Lomsky, Minister of National Defence.

As observers **from the People's Republic of China**—Chen Yun, Vice-Premier

of the Government Council ; and Li Fuchun, Vice-Premier of the Government Council.

Anton Yugov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, presided over the session.

In conformity with Article 3 of the Warsaw Treaty, envisaging consultations between the states, parties to the treaty, on all major international questions affecting their interests, an exchange of opinion on the present international situation took place at the meeting of the Consultative Committee. The Political Consultative Committee noted with satisfaction the complete unanimity of the socialist countries, parties to the meeting, both in assessing the international situation and their common tasks in the struggle for peace and the security of the peoples. The Political Consultative Committee unanimously adopted a declaration of the states, parties to the Warsaw Treaty, which is published in the press.

The Political Consultative Committee heard a report by Marshal of the Soviet Union I. S. Koniev, Commander-in-Chief of the Joint Armed Forces of the states, parties to the Warsaw Treaty, on a further reduction in the armed forces of the Warsaw Treaty countries, and on the withdrawal of the Soviet forces from the territory of the Rumanian People's Republic.

Besides the further cut in the armed forces of the Soviet Union in 1958 by 300,000 men, which was announced earlier, the states, parties to the Warsaw Treaty, resolved to effect in 1958, in addition to the earlier substantial reduction in their armed forces, another cut in the armed forces by a total of 119,000 men, including: the Rumanian People's Republic by 55,000 men, the Bulgarian People's Republic by 23,000 men, the Polish People's Republic by 20,000 men, the Czechoslovak Republic

by 20,000 men and the Albanian People's Republic by 1,000 men. Thus the Warsaw Treaty member-countries will have reduced their armed forces by 419,000 men in 1958.

The Political Consultative Committee approved a proposal of the government of the Soviet Union, agreed with the government of the Rumanian People's Republic, on the withdrawal in the near future from the Rumanian People's Republic of the Soviet troops stationed there in conformity with the Warsaw Treaty.

The Soviet government, by agreement with the Hungarian government, resolved to reduce, in 1958, the Soviet troops stationed in Hungary by one division and to withdraw it from Hungarian territory.

The Political Consultative Committee approved this decision of the Soviet government.

Decisions were also taken on certain organisational matters involved in the activity of the Joint Armed Forces of the states, parties to the Warsaw Treaty.

The Political Consultative Committee resolved to address to the member-states of the North Atlantic Treaty (N.A.T.O.) a proposal concerning the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the states, parties to the Warsaw Treaty, and the N.A.T.O. member-states. The text of the draft of the aforesaid non-aggression pact is published separately.

The proceedings of the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the states, parties to the Warsaw Treaty, demonstrated the complete unity, unbreakable fraternal friendship and co-operation of the socialist countries, which are concentrating their efforts on a relaxation of international tension, the creation of an atmosphere of mutual confidence and businesslike co-operation between all states, for the further consolidation of peace.

## DECLARATION OF THE STATES PARTIES TO THE WARSAW TREATY

**The following is the full text of the Declaration signed in Moscow on May 24 by the representatives of the countries that are signatories to the Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance :**

**G**UIDED by the interests of ensuring peace in Europe and developing peaceful co-operation among states, which is the basic task of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, the governments of the People's Republic of Albania, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Rumanian People's Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Czechoslovak Republic convened in Moscow on May 24, 1958, a conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty countries so as to examine the existing international situation and work out new joint measures to ease international tension.

The exchange of views, in which an observer from the Chinese People's Republic also took part, confirmed the unanimity of the governments represented at the conference, both in their estimate of the international situation and with regard to the ways of strengthening peace.

The state of affairs in the world is being influenced to an ever greater extent by the unceasing struggle of the countries of the socialist camp for the development of international co-operation on the basis of the peaceful co-existence of states with different social structures, for the settlement of disputed questions by means of negotiations between states, for the ending of the arms race and the removal of the threat of atomic war.

The participants in the conference note with satisfaction that today it is not only the socialist countries that are directing their efforts towards strengthening peace but also most of the countries of Asia and Africa that have freed themselves from age-old colonial dependence.

Peace is also supported by the masses of the people and influential public circles, by many parties and trade unions that heed the demands of the workers, by scientists and workers in the cultural field, by clergymen, by people of different political outlooks in the countries of Western Europe, America and other continents. States pursuing a policy of neutrality are also making a positive contribution to the struggle for peace.

The development of international events is again and again giving proof of the fact that the Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance, signed three years ago by eight socialist states, not only reliably safeguards the security and independence of the peoples of these states but also constitutes a mighty deterrent to the activities of the military groupings of the western powers and, first and foremost, of the North Atlantic bloc, which are hostile to the cause of peace.

Those circles of the western powers and, in the first place, of the United States, who have closely linked their policy with the continuance of the "cold war" and international tension are, as hitherto, seeking to pursue a "positions of strength" policy, and to hinder the peoples from shaping their lives according to their own will. They bear the responsibility for the unceasing arms race which is acquiring an especially dangerous nature in connection with the expanding production and stockpiling of nuclear means of mass destruction. An unbearably heavy burden of military expenditure has been heaped upon the peoples of the N.A.T.O. countries. Judging only by official N.A.T.O. figures, the military expenditures of the member-countries of this bloc in 1957 were three times as great as in 1950. In all,

during the period from 1950 to 1957, the N.A.T.O. countries spent more than 400,000 million dollars on war preparations.

At the present time the N.A.T.O. military bodies are working out new plans to increase the armed forces and military expenditure of those countries, while the N.A.T.O. War Ministers' conference in April this year discussed the question of doubling the size of the armed forces placed at the disposal of the American supreme commander of N.A.T.O. It is, moreover, well known that on May 1 this year, the permanent Council of N.A.T.O. took a decision providing for the atomic arming of those participants in the North Atlantic bloc who do not at present possess such weapons. The governments of a number of N.A.T.O. countries, such as Britain, France, Italy, Turkey, and others, have, in spite of resolute protests by the population, submitted the territories of their countries for use as American launching sites for rockets bearing nuclear warheads and as storehouses for atomic weapons.

The war preparations in the Federal Republic of Germany, whose Bundestag has taken a decision empowering the Federal government to arm the West German armed forces with nuclear and rocket weapons, are coming to be of a particularly dangerous character. Thus the most dangerous types of weapons are falling into the hands of militarist and revenge-seeking circles who are raising territorial claims against other states.

The United States government, in lending its support to the policy of arming the Federal Republic of Germany and taking upon itself the task of supplying Western Germany with nuclear and rocket weapons is, as a matter of fact, encouraging these circles to pursue a policy fraught with danger to peace and disastrous consequences for the German people themselves. Measures are being taken, at the same time, to involve Western Germany in manufacturing and perfecting new types of weapons, this purpose being served by the disclosed tripartite agreement between France, Italy and the Federal Republic of Germany, on co-operation in the sphere of military

research and the manufacture of armaments.

These military preparations are giving rise to grave fears in Western Germany itself and are meeting with ever-increasing opposition from the West German population.

The present situation is being worsened in an extremely dangerous way by the practice, unheard of in time of peace, of flights by United States air force planes with atomic and hydrogen bombs over the Arctic areas towards the Soviet Union. As is well known, flights of American bombers with atomic and hydrogen bombs are also carried out over the territories of many West European countries under the pretext of patrolling the air space. These actions by the United States government border on direct provocation and if they are not stopped, mankind may any day find itself engulfed in the hurricane of a rocket and atomic war.

One cannot fail to note with satisfaction the fact that certain N.A.T.O. member-states, aware of the direction in which the policy of preparing for an atomic war and juggling with atomic weapons pursued by the major powers of this grouping is leading, are adopting a saner attitude—a circumstance which cannot fail to constitute a definite positive contribution to the relaxation of international tension, particularly in Europe. This is one of the examples showing that, even when there exist aggressive military groupings and commitments imposed by their sponsors upon the other participants in those groupings, there still remain unused possibilities for a *détente* in the European situation and for reducing international tension.

A heavy blow at the hopes of the peoples for lessening the danger of war and curtailing the atomic arms race has been dealt by the governments of the United States and Britain, who have carried out new nuclear test explosions in the Pacific even after the Soviet Union has unilaterally ceased tests of all types of hydrogen and atomic weapons. These explosions show what little concern to the governments of the United States and Britain are the interests of the peoples

demanding that an end be put to the preparations for atomic war and that real steps be taken to remove the threat of such a war.

The participants in the conference express serious concern in connection with the unceasing attempts of the governments of the United States, Britain, France and other colonial powers to interfere in the internal affairs of countries of Asia and Africa, to impose upon them regimes and governments that are alien to the peoples and are ready once again to sell out to the colonialists their countries, which have recently taken the path of national independence. If in Indonesia, Algeria, Lebanon, Yemen and Oman guns are firing and the blood of patriots is being shed, the blame for this rests with those same imperialist circles whose policy is being pursued by N.A.T.O., the Baghdad Pact organisation and S.E.A.T.O., and who, by means of pressure and flagrant interference in the internal affairs of other states, are seeking to lay their hands on the natural resources of these countries and to strangle the national liberation movement of the peoples of Asia and Africa. Just as last summer the clouds gathered over Syria, so today dangerous schemes are being carried out against Lebanon, and this time the United States, falling back on the notorious "Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine," which has been rejected by the Arab peoples, is making ready to set its armed forces in action against a state which wants nothing more than to be master in its own house and to be free from foreign dictation.

It would not be out of place to pose the question of who gave any state the right to impose various doctrines on other countries. Indeed, the time has long since passed when force and arbitrary behaviour could disregard law and even be presented as law. The Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine has clearly pursued the aim of meddling in the affairs of other states, and its authors have not scrupled to declare this openly. And all this is taking place before the eyes of the United Nations, which, so it would seem, should react to deeds constituting interference in the internal life

of the countries of the East, in as much as this is a breach of international law and is condemned by the United Nations Charter. The United Nations, however, owing to the position of certain western powers, remains paralysed and is taking no steps to safeguard the independence of Lebanon or of other states either, which are being subjected to the schemes of imperialist circles.

There exists the opportunity for the United Nations to become a genuinely international organisation and an effective instrument in the struggle for peace, provided all its member-states are guided, not by their narrow interests, but by the interests of peace and the security of nations.

The Warsaw Treaty countries have directed, and will continue to direct their actions towards enabling the United Nations to accomplish successfully the tasks entrusted to it by the Charter.

The states parties to the Warsaw Treaty are convinced that the denial to the Chinese People's Republic of the possibility of occupying its lawful place in the United Nations is doing serious harm to the activities of the United Nations. They are also profoundly convinced that the participation of People's China in the activities of the United Nations would be of great positive significance for the maintenance of peace in the Far East, and also for the cause of peace throughout the world.

For a number of years France has been waging a bloody war against the people of Algeria, who are fighting for self-determination and independence. The war in Algeria not only constitutes a monstrous injustice against the freedom-loving Algerian people but also creates a dangerous hotbed of international tensions and conflicts in that part of the world.

The sponsors of N.A.T.O. and the other blocs of the western powers associated with it are striving to conceal the war preparations being carried out by them on an ever-increasing scale and their interference in the internal affairs of other countries by false references to the "danger of international com-

munism." Whether it is a question of equipping the Bundeswehr with atomic weapons or of preparing armed intervention in the affairs of Lebanon, of deploying American rocket installations in foreign countries or of increasing budget allocations for military purposes, of sending American planes with atomic and hydrogen bombs to the frontiers of the Soviet Union or of restricting international trade—in all these cases this device, which is far from new, is brought into play.

Can anyone have forgotten that the preparations of Hitler Germany for the Second World War were also carried out under the banner of the struggle against the "danger" of communism. Millions upon millions of people who let themselves be misled by that false propaganda paid for it with their lives in the last war. It cannot be assumed that the nations have not drawn conclusions from those dramatic lessons and have not learned, on the basis of their own experience, to discern the real source of the threat of war.

The states united by the Warsaw Treaty and also the socialist states of Asia do not have and cannot have any motives for attacking other countries and seizing foreign lands. The Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and the socialist camp as a whole possess immense expanses of land and untold natural resources. But the main wealth of the socialist countries are the people, the inexhaustible creative forces of the nations which have liberated themselves from exploitation and are following the path of social progress. There is no chance of any groups or sections of the population interested in war emerging in any of these countries, since power in them is wielded by the workers and peasants and they are the ones who bear the greatest sacrifices in any war. They create all the necessary material wealth with their own hands and it is not in their nature to covet what is not theirs.

The people of our countries are devoting all their efforts to the creation of a new social system which will guarantee general prosperity and allow for the comprehensive and maximum

development of man's spiritual abilities. And for this purpose they need, first and foremost, firm and lasting peace. That is why nothing can be more remote from the truth than the allegations that the socialist countries can threaten anyone or that they want to force their way of life on to others.

The states that are parties to the Warsaw Treaty have no reason whatsoever to fear the easing of international tension; they are united, not by the "cold war" atmosphere, not by the state of war hysteria in which the advocates of military preparations want to keep the world, but by their common ideals and aims in the building of the new socialist society and the strengthening of peace among nations. An improvement in the international situation is feared by those who do not want to risk the loss of fabulous profits extracted from the pockets of taxpayers owing to the arms race, and who stand for the preservation of military groupings, the existence of which will become absolutely unjustifiable and superfluous if tension decreases, if confidence among the states is enhanced and the "cold war" ended.

The states signatories to the Warsaw Treaty resolutely condemn the course pursued in N.A.T.O. by the leading states of this aggressive grouping—a course aimed at worsening the international situation and preparing for an atomic war. They call upon the governments of the countries of the North Atlantic Alliance not to permit at the present critical time any steps that might further worsen the already grave situation in Europe and in some other parts of the world. For the war danger not to grow, but to decrease, for mutual mistrust and suspicion among states to give way to confidence and businesslike co-operation, it is necessary, above all, to refrain from such actions as the reckless deeds of the American air force or the decision concerning the atomic arming of Western Germany, which constitutes a challenge to all European nations.

The socialist countries of Europe and Asia have given ample proof of their good will and desire for co-operation with other states in the interests of

strengthening peace among nations. All the parties to the Warsaw Treaty have repeatedly carried out unilateral reductions of their armed forces, which since 1955 have been reduced by 2,477,000 men. The armaments, war material and defence expenditures of these countries have been reduced accordingly. During this period the Soviet Union has cut its armed forces by 2,140,000 men; the Polish People's Republic has cut its armed forces by 141,500 men, the corresponding figure for the Czechoslovak Republic being 44,000; for the German Democratic Republic, 30,000; the Rumanian People's Republic, 60,000; the People's Republic of Bulgaria, 18,000; the Hungarian People's Republic, 35,000; and the People's Republic of Albania, 9,000.

No one can deny that states carrying out reductions in their armed forces to such a considerable extent are preparing, not for war, but for peaceful co-operation. And on the contrary, when states are building up their armaments and increasing their armed forces, this is a sure sign that they, or rather those who shape their policy, are thinking not of peace, but of war.

It appears that the N.A.T.O. countries are responding to the reduction of the armed forces and military expenditures of the states that are parties to the Warsaw Treaty by increasing the number of their troops, augmenting their military budgets and building up their armaments. By pursuing this policy, the N.A.T.O. leaders would like to prevent the relaxation of international tension and the reaching of agreement among states which would guarantee their peaceful co-existence, and in that way to impel the Warsaw Treaty states to participate in the arms race and in the "cold war," so as to slow down peaceful construction and the improvement of the living standards of the peoples of the socialist countries. All this makes it incumbent upon the peoples to be on their guard and to be more active in the struggle against forces working towards the preparations for war.

The participants in the conference take pride in the fact that of the three powers possessing nuclear weapons it was

a state belonging to the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, namely the Soviet Union, that undertook a step of a very humane nature in adopting the decision to discontinue unilaterally tests of all types of atomic and hydrogen weapons. This noble step of historic significance paves the way for the final deliverance of mankind from the threat of a devastating atomic war. The government of the Chinese People's Republic has taken, and is rapidly carrying out, the decision to withdraw the Chinese volunteers from Korea. The United States would have contributed in no small measure to the consolidation of peace in the Far East and to the settlement of the Korean question if it had followed the example of People's China and withdrawn its forces from South Korea, also dismantling all its bases on South Korean territory.

The government of the Polish People's Republic has displayed valuable initiative, which has as its aim the removal of the danger of an atomic war in Europe and which has met with wide international recognition, in proposing the creation in central Europe of a zone free from the production, deployment and use of atomic, hydrogen and rocket weapons.

The proposal of the government of the German Democratic Republic concerning the establishment of a German confederation has opened up a real prospect for ending the unnatural situation in Germany which, 13 years after the end of the war, still remains split into two parts. The governments of the states represented at the conference express their appreciation of this proposal and give it their wholehearted support.

With a view to settling urgent international issues and meeting the universal demand of the peoples that measures be taken to ease international tension and eliminate the "cold war," the Soviet Union, having consulted the other socialist countries, came out with a proposal that a summit conference be held of leading statesmen of East and West. The governments of the Warsaw Treaty countries regard the summit conference as a major means, in the existing

circumstances, to protect mankind from the disaster of war and to direct developments in the international field towards the strengthening of peace. The participants in the conference express their satisfaction at the fact that the agenda for the summit conference proposed by the Soviet side contains questions for whose solution there exist real prerequisites and whose settlement would promote an improvement in the situation and the strengthening of security in Europe, and would also facilitate the removal of mutual distrust. These questions are:

1. The immediate ending of tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons.
2. Renunciation by the U.S.S.R., the United States and Great Britain of the use of nuclear weapons.
3. The establishment in Central Europe of a zone free from atomic, hydrogen and rocket weapons.
4. The conclusion of a non-aggression agreement between members of the North Atlantic Alliance and states parties to the Warsaw Treaty.
5. The reduction of the number of foreign troops on the territory of Germany and within the frontiers of other European states.
6. The drawing up of an agreement on questions connected with the prevention of a surprise attack.
7. Measures for the extension of international trade ties.
8. The ending of war propaganda.
9. Ways of easing tension in the Middle East area.
10. Prohibition of the use of outer space for military purposes, the liquidation of foreign military bases on alien territories, and international co-operation in exploring outer space.
11. The conclusion of a German peace treaty.
12. The development of ties and contacts between countries.

First among these questions is the ending of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests. The governments responsible for the destinies of their peoples have no right to ignore the warnings uttered by thousands of scientists from various countries of the world against the

harmful effects of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests and the dreadful consequences of a nuclear war. One cannot but take into account the warnings of the scientists who point out that in the event of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests continuing further as they have hitherto, millions of people in every generation will be affected by hereditary diseases.

The immediate ending of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests accords with the hopes and aspirations of people all over the world who are alarmed by the dreadful consequences of these tests. An agreement on this issue would halt the creation of new and ever more lethal types of nuclear weapons and would be a major step towards the cessation of the atomic arms race.

One cannot fail to see that the refusal by the governments of the United States and Britain to follow the example set by the Soviet Union, and the continuation of their atomic and hydrogen weapon tests can only throw mankind back to the starting point on this question, which is of the utmost importance for its destiny, in which case the grave responsibility would rest entirely with the governments of the United States and Britain. The participants in the conference declare that the peoples of the states they represent, being fully determined to use all possible means to promote the consolidation of peace and the prevention of a new world conflagration, are interested in establishing in the centre of the European continent a zone free of atomic, hydrogen and rocket weapons and including the two German states—the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany—and also Poland and Czechoslovakia.

In giving support to the proposal of the Polish People's Republic on the establishment of a zone free from nuclear and rocket weapons, the participants in the conference are not seeking any military advantages for themselves.

A comparison between the territories of the states to be included in an atom-free zone will show that the territory of the German Democratic Republic,

Czechoslovakia and Poland is more than double that of the fourth state in this zone—Western Germany. Furthermore, the population of the Warsaw Treaty states in this zone also exceeds the population of the member of the North Atlantic Alliance in this zone. As regards their own production of nuclear weapons it is known that none of these countries—the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland or the Federal Republic of Germany—manufactures this kind of weapon. Moreover, the government of the Federal Republic of Germany at one time assumed an international obligation not to manufacture such weapons in the future. All this is evidence of the absence of any grounds for supposing that the establishment of an atom-free zone will offer any one-sided military advantage to the Warsaw Treaty countries to the detriment of the interests of N.A.T.O. states. On the contrary, the realism of the proposal for an atom-free zone in Europe consists in the very fact that the member-states of the Warsaw Treaty and the member-states of N.A.T.O. would, in accordance with this proposal, reciprocally undertake such measures in the field of atomic disarmament as would, taken as a whole, be equal in their military significance.

The participants in the conference welcome the readiness of the Soviet Union, as one of the major states possessing nuclear weapons, to assume the obligation to respect the status of the atom-free zone and to regard the territory of the countries of this zone as being excluded from the sphere of the use of atomic, hydrogen and rocket weapons.

It is to be regretted that the government of a non-European power—the United States—not only hastened to declare its negative attitude to the proposal for the establishment of an atom-free zone in the centre of Europe, but also considered it possible to bring pressure to bear upon its European N.A.T.O. allies so as to complicate the submission of this proposal to the summit conference and its subsequent examination. This initiative, however,

is aimed at achieving a *détente* in Central Europe and at reducing the possibility of an atomic war breaking out in this region. The implementation of this initiative, directed as it is towards a partial solution, would facilitate the achievement of broader agreements in the field of disarmament, thus contributing to reaching the main goal of all the peoples, that is to say, the removal of the danger of an atomic war in Europe, and thereby war in general. It should be noted that it is precisely in this sense that this initiative has been interpreted by broad circles of public opinion and various political circles in the West.

The ruling circles of some members of N.A.T.O., professing their desire for successful negotiations, are actually going all out to make it more difficult to convene a summit conference, if not to avoid such a conference altogether. It is with this aim in view that the trumped up question is raised of the so-called situation in the East European countries—a question which in actual fact does not exist. The participants in the conference resolutely reject any discussions of this question as inadmissible interference in the domestic affairs of sovereign states which is incompatible with international law and the United Nations Charter. The states taking part in the conference declare that they will not tolerate any interference in the internal affairs of their countries, whose peoples have firmly and irrevocably taken the road of building socialism and who are determined to safeguard the work of their peoples and their security against any schemes from outside.

As to the attempts to bring before a summit conference the question of German unity, they can only serve the purposes of those who want to prevent the calling of a summit conference and do not want to see it brought to a successful conclusion. The states that are parties to the Warsaw Treaty fully understand the desire of the German people for the elimination of the division of the country and they are in favour of the restoration of Germany's unity and the establishment of a peaceful, democratic

German state. But they believe that this problem can only be solved by the German people themselves as represented by the two German states now in existence, and only through agreement between them. There is no other way of solving the German question. Other states, no matter what rights they may claim, are not competent to tackle this problem over the heads of the German people and the governments of the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany by which they are represented.

The participants in the conference fully share the opinion of the Soviet government that a summit conference should discuss that part of the German problem which is the responsibility of the four powers, namely, the question of a German peace treaty. The participation of representatives from both German states in the preparation of a peace treaty, as proposed by the Soviet Union, would give the German people a clear prospect of Germany's future development and would serve as an impetus to uniting the efforts of the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany in the restoration of the German people's national state unity.

The states that are parties to the Warsaw Treaty attach great importance to the participation in a summit conference of neutral states which are not bound by military obligations to either of the opposing military groupings and which have proved their adherence to the cause of peace and international co-operation. The participants in the conference cannot but express their regret that the U.S.S.R.'s proposal on the participation of neutral states in a summit conference meets with no support from the western powers.

In view of the fact that the western powers are not inclined to hold a conference with a broad representation, the governments of the countries parties to the Warsaw Treaty find it possible, in the interests of achieving the necessary agreement, not to insist on the participation in the summit conference of all states that are members of the North Atlantic Pact and all states parties to the

Warsaw Treaty and agree at the present stage to a more limited number of participants in the meeting so that the North Atlantic Pact and the Warsaw Treaty are represented in the talks by three (four) countries each.

For this purpose they give full powers to the Soviet Union, the Polish People's Republic, the Czechoslovak Republic (the Rumanian People's Republic) to take part in a summit conference on behalf of the countries that are signatories to the Warsaw Treaty.

The participants in this conference have come to the unanimous conclusion that the present situation demands of all states new efforts towards easing international tension and solving the most important outstanding problems of our time. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries parties to the Warsaw Treaty have consistently sought agreement with the western powers on questions connected with the disarmament problem. With these aims in view, they have not only put forward specific proposals but have unilaterally taken a number of practical steps in this sphere. However, the governments of the United States, Britain, France and other countries that are members of the North Atlantic Pact have not responded to all these proposals and continue to pursue the policy of the "cold war" and of building up their armed forces and armaments in a dangerous way.

Taking advantage of the fact that they commanded the majority in the United Nations Disarmament Commission and its sub-committee, the western powers evaded businesslike, honest negotiations and on August 29, 1957, put forward such proposals as, in fact, not only failed to provide for the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons and the reduction of the armed forces and armaments of states but also flung the door wide open for a further arms race.

Having imposed these proposals upon the last session of the General Assembly and taken steps to maintain in the U.N. Disarmament Commission the predominance of members of the military blocs organised by them, the western powers have created in the U.N. Disarmament

Commission a situation that precludes all hopes of a positive solution to the question of disarmament within that body. In these conditions the best prospects for a solution to urgent questions of disarmament on which there already exists a possibility of coming to mutually acceptable agreements, are opened up by a summit conference with the participation of heads of government.

The states parties to the Warsaw Treaty consider it their duty to exert the maximum efforts to urge the western powers genuinely to take the path of disarmament and thereby to prevent military conflict on the continent of Europe and to avoid the tragedy of a new war. Representatives of the states that are parties to the Warsaw Treaty have met to substantiate, not by words but by new and definite deeds and proposals, their heartfelt desire for the strengthening of peace and security in Europe. Desirous of breaking the deadlock on the disarmament problem and of achieving a turn towards the strengthening of confidence and peaceful co-operation among states, the governments represented at the conference have taken a decision to bring about unilaterally a further reduction of the armed forces of the states that are parties to the Warsaw Treaty by 419,000 men. Armaments, war material, and military expenditures will be reduced accordingly.

The participants in the conference have heard and discussed the proposal of the Soviet government, agreed upon with the government of the Rumanian People's Republic, to withdraw from the territory of the Rumanian People's Republic the Soviet troops stationed there under the Warsaw Treaty. The participants in the conference approve of this proposal and express their confidence that it will be received by all the peoples as further proof of the consistent peace-loving policy pursued by socialist countries.

The governments of the states parties to the Warsaw Treaty express the hope that the United States of America, Britain, France and other North Atlantic Pact countries will, for their part, take steps to reduce their armed forces and

armaments and thus prove by deeds their desire to strengthen peace and security in Europe. The association of the N.A.T.O. members with the measures of the socialist countries for the reduction of armed forces and armaments would contribute not only to a *détente* in relations between European countries and to the ending of the arms race, but would also provide a possibility of relieving the peoples of Europe of the inflated military budgets which year by year devour an ever-increasing part of the material resources of states, and would open the way towards the economic and spiritual wellbeing of the peoples.

The parties to the Warsaw Treaty advocate the abolition of all military blocs and groupings since the existence of those blocs and groupings leads to the worsening of relations between states and creates a constant danger of a military conflict between them. However, taking into consideration the fact that the western powers are not ready to disband the military groupings created by them and to establish instead an effective system of collective security in Europe and also in other regions of the world, the participants in the conference consider it necessary to take preventive measures to ease the frictions that arise and to prevent contradictions between the two major groupings of states from growing into a military conflict. For this purpose they propose that the countries that are parties to the Warsaw Treaty and the North Atlantic Pact should conclude a non-aggression pact which could be based on the following reciprocal commitments:

1. Not to resort to the use of force against each other, or to the threat of force;
2. To refrain from any interference in each other's internal affairs;
3. To solve all disputes that may arise between them by peaceful means only, in a spirit of understanding and justice, through negotiations between the parties concerned;
4. To hold mutual consultations when a situation arises that might endanger peace in Europe.

The conference has drawn up a draft of a non-aggression pact between the N.A.T.O. member-states and the Warsaw Treaty countries which it has been decided to hand over to the governments of the N.A.T.O. countries.

The states parties to the Warsaw Treaty call upon the N.A.T.O. countries to accept this proposal to conclude a non-aggression pact. They are convinced that if the N.A.T.O. powers finally found it possible to agree to the conclusion of a non-aggression pact with the Warsaw Treaty states, this would constitute a beginning of the desired turn in the development of the international situation towards confidence and peaceful co-operation between the states now opposing each other as members of military groupings. It is, after all, clear to everybody that a new war can break out only as the result of a conflict between these two groupings. On the other hand, it is no less clear that if the machinery of these military groupings, embracing 23 states with the most developed war industries, is not set in motion for attack against each other, there will be no such war.

Furthermore, the obligation of non-aggression is an efficient deterrent and violation of this obligation, as the experience of history proves, places an aggressor in a position of international isolation facilitating the consolidation of the forces opposing aggression, and thereby facilitating the defeat of an aggressor.

The participants in the conference note as a positive sign the fact that the idea of a non-aggression pact met with a favourable response on the part of the British government, which was made clear by Mr. Macmillan, the Prime Minister of Britain, some time ago.

The states parties to the Warsaw Treaty are ready at any time to appoint their representatives for an exchange of views with representatives of the N.A.T.O. members on matters arising from the proposal to conclude a non-aggression pact. Such an exchange of views could take place immediately before a summit conference and could facilitate the adoption by that conference

of the final decision concerning the conclusion of the pact.

The international situation is such that in taking new steps to end the "cold war," to reduce armed forces and to create conditions for peaceful co-existence, we all have to show sober minds and a sense of responsibility for the security of our socialist countries. We must not allow the sense of vigilance of the peoples of the socialist countries to weaken, for the peaceable efforts by the Warsaw Treaty states do not as yet meet with a response from the governments of the N.A.T.O. countries which are seeking to continue to worsen the international situation and intensify the arms race. It is necessary to continue in the future all efforts to prevent the creation of conditions under which advocates of the "positions of strength" policy could resort to the use of force against the socialist states. This means that in seeking unswervingly for a *détente* in international relations, the Warsaw Treaty states will in no degree whatsoever relax their concern for the security of their peoples. Let the governments of countries basing their policy on "positions of strength" and trying to balance on the "brink of war" always bear in mind that war against the socialist countries can only bring the aggressor to his doom.

The states represented at the conference declare that they will do their utmost to defend unremittingly the cause of peace and to struggle for the prevention of a new war. They consider that at the present time the governments of states do not and cannot have a more pressing and noble task than that of establishing lasting peace and ridding the peoples of the threat of a devastating nuclear war. They also consider that the governments should proceed in international affairs, not from what separates the countries, but from what draws them together, in order to ensure, by joint efforts, peace in Europe, and consequently throughout the world.

Wars have on many an occasion brought calamity and destruction to Europe. The many ruins of towns and

villages in the countries of Europe which are to be seen even now bear witness to this. Many millions of crippled people are also a reminder of wars. The tens of millions of men, women and children devoured by the flames of the Second World War are still alive in memory. It is the duty of the governments of all states to prevent a new outbreak and to save Europe and mankind from a new and immeasurably graver tragedy. Europe, with its monuments of centuries-old culture and its numerous big industrial centres, must cease to be a battlefield. It can and must become a zone of peace, tranquillity and security.

War is not inevitable; war can be prevented. The joint efforts of the peoples can protect and strengthen peace. Moscow. May 24, 1958

## DRAFT PACT OF NON-AGGRESSION Between States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty and States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty

**T**HE High Contracting Parties, states parties to the Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance of May 14, 1955, on the one hand, and states parties to the North Atlantic Treaty of April 4, 1949, on the other hand,

**Being desirous** of putting into effect in international relations the aims and principles of the Charter of the United Nations;

**Attaching** great importance to the necessity of maintaining and developing peaceful relations and co-operation between states on the basis of equality, non-interference in internal affairs, non-aggression, mutual respect for territorial integrity and state sovereignty;

**Inspired** by the desire to promote the relaxation of international tension and the creation of an atmosphere of uni-

*This Declaration bears the signatures of M. Shehu, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Albania; A. Yugov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria; J. Kadar, Minister of State of the Hungarian People's Republic; O. Grotewohl, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the German Democratic Republic; J. Cyrankiewicz, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic; C. Stoica, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Rumanian People's Republic; N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.; and V. Siroky, Prime Minister of the Czechoslovak Republic.*

versal confidence in relations between states;

**And considering** that in view of the existence in Europe of two opposing groupings it will be of great importance for improving the international situation, terminating the arms race and removing the threat of a new war if the members of these groupings undertake reciprocal obligations not to resort to the use or threat of force in international relations;

**Have decided** to conclude the present Pact of Non-Aggression and have authorised it to be signed: for the states parties to the Warsaw Treaty by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Polish People's Republic, the Czechoslovak Republic and the Rumanian People's Republic; for the states parties to the North Atlantic Treaty by. . . .

**Article 1.** Noting that the use or

threat of force in international relations is prohibited by international law and, in particular, by the Charter of the United Nations, the states parties to the Warsaw Treaty and the states parties to the North Atlantic Treaty solemnly undertake to observe strictly this prohibition and not to resort to the use or threat of force against one another, jointly or separately.

**Article 2.** All disputes that may arise between one or more parties to the Warsaw Treaty, on the one hand, and one or more parties to the North Atlantic Treaty, on the other hand, shall be resolved by peaceful means only, on the basis of the invariable observance of the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of states, in the spirit of mutual understanding and through negotiations between the parties concerned or by using other means of peaceful settlement of international disputes as provided for by the United Nations Charter.

**Article 3.** Should a situation arise which might endanger the preservation of peace or security in Europe, the states parties to the present Pact shall consult together with a view to taking and implementing such joint measures

as, in conformity with the United Nations Charter, may be considered appropriate for a peaceful settlement.

**Article 4.** The present Pact has been concluded for a period of 25 years.

The Pact shall come into force on the day of its signing by duly authorised representatives of the states parties to the Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance of May 14, 1955, and the states parties to the North Atlantic Treaty of April 4, 1949.

In the event of the North Atlantic Treaty of April 4, 1949, and the Warsaw Treaty of May 14, 1955, being terminated, the present pact will become invalid.

**Article 5.** The present Pact, of which the Russian, English and French texts are authentic, shall be deposited for safe-keeping with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Duly certified copies thereof shall be transmitted by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to the governments of states parties to the present Pact. In witness whereof the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Pact and have affixed thereto their seals.

Done in the city of. . . .

## N. S. KHRUSHCHOV'S SPEECH at Meeting of Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Treaty

**N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers and head of the Soviet delegation at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty, made the following speech at the committee's meeting on May 24 :**

**D**EAR COMRADES, more than two years have passed since the last meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the states parties to the Warsaw Treaty, held in Prague in 1956. This period has been packed with many important international events.

In summing up briefly the meaning and significance of these events, we may say with confidence that the principal result of the last two years is the further growth of the strength of the countries of the socialist camp and their increased cohesion, and the growth of the forces

of peace throughout the world. These factors are having an ever-increasing effect on the international climate, tending to remove the danger of a new war and to consolidate world peace.

It would be a mistake, however, to ignore the fact that influential circles of the imperialist powers, in spite of the obvious failures of their "positions of strength" policy, are intensifying their military preparations, openly banking on preparing a war with the use of nuclear and rocket weapons.

In these conditions the principal task today, just as was the case at our 1956 meeting in Prague, is to wage a persistent struggle for peace, to remove the threat of a new war breaking out, for the relations among states to be based on the principles of peaceful co-existence and businesslike co-operation. The efforts of all peaceloving states and peace supporters in all countries must be aimed at ending the arms race, ending the "cold war" and establishing an

atmosphere of trust in international relations.

Wars between states have always brought down grave disasters upon the peoples. But a future war, if the aggressors succeed in unleashing it, threatens to become the most devastating war in the history of mankind, because there is no guarantee that it would not become a nuclear war, with all its catastrophic consequences. Millions of people would perish; great cities and industrial centres would be razed from the face of the Earth; unique cultural monuments created by mankind throughout the ages would be irrevocably destroyed in the conflagration of such a war, and vast territories would be poisoned with radioactive fall-out.

Therefore there is not, nor can be, any task more important or noble than that of barring the road to a new war, of relieving the peoples of our planet of the grave danger that is looming over them. This is what the supreme interests of mankind demand.

## Overcoming the Resistance of the Forces Hindering the Normalisation of the International Situation and Peaceful Co-existence

**T**HE peoples refuse to reconcile themselves to the growing danger of the outbreak of a nuclear war and with ever-increasing determination they are opposing the aggressive policy of certain influential western circles. The resistance of broad masses of the people to the adventurist policy of "balancing on the brink of war" has assumed unprecedented scope.

Mass public organisations, trade unions, people prominent in culture and science, members of the clergy, millions of ordinary men and women in all countries of the world are coming out in favour of the peaceful co-existence of states, irrespective of their social systems, in favour of settling outstand-

ing international problems by peaceful negotiation, in favour of a radical relaxation of international tension.

Not only the governments of the countries of the socialist camp but also many governments of other peaceloving states, and in particular those which have recently freed themselves from colonial oppression, are supporting the idea of negotiations for the purpose of easing international tension.

One should bear in mind, however, that along with the steady growth of the forces striving to strengthen peace and to rid mankind of the danger of a devastating nuclear war, those circles in imperialist states who pin their hopes on continuing the "positions of strength"

policy and preparing a new war, are also intensifying their activity.

These circles were alarmed by the fact that after the Geneva conference of the heads of government of the four powers in 1955 there appeared signs of a relaxation of international tension. They feared lest the extension of businesslike co-operation between socialist and capitalist states might result in an easing of international tension, in the ending of the "cold war," which would provide prerequisites for solving the disarmament problem.

Certain influential circles regard such a course of events as a threat to their own selfish interests. They fear lest the solution of the disarmament problem, and consequently a drastic cut in military spending, might result in a considerable reduction of the super-profits which monopolies are making out of military orders. For this reason the monopolies are interested in preventing the relaxation of international tension, in preserving the state of "cold war," in once again worsening the relations among countries.

A clear example of the efforts of international reactionary forces to worsen the international atmosphere and create a dangerous hotbed of war in Europe was the counter-revolutionary uprising staged in Hungary. That gamble fell through, however. The Hungarian people, with the assistance of countries of the socialist camp, upheld their own people's power and gave a fitting rebuff to the international reactionary forces and the Hungarian counter-revolution.

The smashing of the counter-revolutionary uprising in Hungary demonstrated in a completely convincing way the strength of the people's democratic system, the might and cohesion of the socialist camp.

The events in the Middle East, when certain western circles launched an open military attack on Egypt, are still fresh in everyone's memory. By organising the British, French and Israeli aggression against Egypt, those circles planned to cash in on the Hungarian events and

suppress the national liberation movement in the Middle East, to restore their colonial domination both in Egypt and in the other countries in that area.

The heroic resistance of the Egyptian people, and also the firm stand and assistance of the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and the other countries of the socialist camp, had a sobering effect on the belligerent circles of Britain, France and Israel and made them end the aggression and withdraw their armed forces from Egyptian territory.

The successful struggle of the Egyptian people against the foreign invaders resulted in the consolidation of the freedom and independence, not only of Egypt, but of other Arab states as well. Seeing in this a threat to the domination of the American monopolies in the Middle East countries, the United States put forward the so-called Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine. This doctrine has the aim of facilitating—under the pretext of filling the "vacuum" allegedly formed following the defeat of Britain and France—the American monopolies' task of replacing Britain and France in the Arab East and extinguishing the national liberation movement in Africa and the Middle East.

It is common knowledge that the "Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine" met with resistance in the Middle East countries, whose peoples have learned sufficiently well from their own experience what colonial oppression is like.

Having suffered a defeat in this fresh attempt to establish their domination in the Middle East, the initiators of this colonialist doctrine began to hatch plots against Syria. By conspiring against the lawful Syrian government they counted on sparking off a military conflict between the countries of this area, on worsening the situation in the whole of the Middle East, on strangling Syria's independence and thus attaining their own selfish ends.

At this difficult time the Syrian people received the help and support of the Soviet Union and other peaceloving

countries, which prevented the aggressive circles from carrying out their plans.

The war against the Algerian people, who are upholding their lawful right to self-determination and independence, is still continuing. A peaceful settlement of the Algerian question through the satisfaction of these just demands of the Algerian people and with due consideration for the historically-shaped relations between France and Algeria would be in line with the interests of world peace. We are deeply convinced that such a settlement will be in keeping with the interests of the peoples both of Algeria and France.

By ending the war against Algeria and thereby eliminating the possible danger of it becoming a large-scale military conflict, which cannot but alarm the Soviet people, France would contribute greatly to the strengthening of world peace.

The systematic raids by British troops on the peaceful towns and villages of Yemen are also continuing to an increasing extent.

These actions of Britain, inflicting numerous losses among the peaceful Yemeni population, are arousing the just anger of all decent people.

An object of foreign intrigues and dangerous provocations at the present time is Lebanon, where the western powers are openly meddling in the internal affairs of that state with a view to establishing a colonial régime there and dealing a blow at the national liberation movement of the peoples of the Arab East in general.

Some states which are members of the aggressive S.E.A.T.O. bloc have embarked upon the path of military interference in the internal affairs of the Indonesian Republic where they are rallying together the local reactionary forces, supplying them with arms, and even smuggling armed hirelings into the country to fight against the lawful government of Indonesia.

Recent events show that the ruling circles of the western powers continue

to go out of their way to step up the arms race, out of which a handful of monopolists are enriching themselves at the expense of millions of ordinary workers, and continue to oppose the easing of international tension and to cling to the "cold war" policy. This is seen particularly clearly from the attitude of the western powers on the question of calling a summit conference with the participation of the heads of government, as proposed by the Soviet Union. Striving to delay the summit meeting, they repeat over and over again that it is necessary to "prepare it carefully," although the entire world knows that preparations are not the point at issue.

In the interests of the early convocation of this meeting, the Soviet government has met half way the wishes of the western powers on several questions.

It agreed to preparatory work being carried out through diplomatic channels and through Foreign Ministers, and also to the holding, in the course of these preliminary conferences, if need be and by mutual consent, of an exchange of views on the problems which the parties suggest for inclusion in the agenda of the summit meeting, for the purpose of ascertaining the desirability of including a particular question and the possibility of taking mutually acceptable decisions on it.

The governments of the western powers, however, are now apparently looking for fresh excuses for shirking a meeting with the participation of the heads of government.

Indeed, although more than five months have gone by since the Soviet Union proposed a summit meeting, the governments of the United States, Britain and France have still given no answer either with regard to the questions involved in organising the conference, namely, concerning its date, venue and composition, or with regard to the range of problems which are to be considered at the conference.

Thus, when it is a question of preparations for a top-level conference

to settle pressing international problems, the western powers and their diplomatic departments certainly move at a snail's pace.

There has been more than enough time to prepare the conference. But the fact is that the leaders who now stand at the helm of the leading N.A.T.O. member-states refuse to take the road of peaceful co-existence, refuse to renounce the policy of cold war.

This is the reason why the much needed turning point in the development of international events towards the normalisation of the international atmosphere has not as yet been reached.

However, we are now living, not in the 18th, and not even in the 19th century, when some rulers or other could ignore the will of the peoples, although it must be said that even in those times that was far from being a safe thing to do. In our days hundreds of millions of people in all countries have advanced to active political life and hardly anyone would be able to ignore indefinitely the will of the peoples for peace.

Already at the present time the more far-sighted political leaders of the capitalist world have realised the need for radical changes in the methods and approach to the solution of international problems. True, one can also not infrequently hear from those leaders of the western powers who shape the policy of military blocs, assurances about their peaceable intentions and readiness to settle international problems by negotiation. But real intentions are gauged, not by words, but by deeds. If we look at the policy of the western powers from this angle, we shall see a totally different picture.

It is a fact, Comrades, that while dragging out negotiations on a summit meeting, the western powers are intensifying their military preparations and for this purpose have already held a series of conferences of various military blocs—N.A.T.O., S.E.A.T.O., the Baghdad Pact.

The feverish haste with which this activity is being developed indicates that the opponents of a relaxation of international tension, sensing the indomitable

force of the popular demand for a summit meeting, want to confront the peoples with accomplished facts, to worsen the atmosphere, to prevent the calling of such a meeting or to doom it to failure.

The western powers are now trying hard to draw more states into military blocs, to unite the existing aggressive groupings—N.A.T.O., S.E.A.T.O. and the Baghdad Pact—in a single bloc under the leadership of the United States of America, and to create new military blocs directed against the Soviet Union and the people's democracies. In this connection one might mention, for instance, the plans for the so-called Mediterranean bloc.

However, try as the imperialists may to camouflage the real purpose of the aggressive blocs, the latest sessions of N.A.T.O., S.E.A.T.O. and the Baghdad Pact show that those taking part in them intend to foment the "cold war," to carry on with their "positions of strength" policy, which has been condemned by the peoples, and to continue the arms race. The establishment of rocket and nuclear bases, the arming of other participants in the blocs with American nuclear weapons—such are the principal items on the agendas of the sessions of these aggressive groupings.

Let us take, for instance, the session of the N.A.T.O. Council of December, 1957, and the session of the S.E.A.T.O. Council held in Manila early this year. They show that the United States, Britain and certain other western countries are carrying out at a forced pace measures in the sphere of military preparations which tend to worsen the international climate. The meeting of N.A.T.O. War Ministers held in April and the N.A.T.O. Council session held early this month in Copenhagen had the same aims.

The plans of the American ruling circles with regard to the Federal Republic of Germany are of special danger to the cause of peace. Ignoring the lessons of the recent past, the United States rulers close their eyes to the fact that arming with atomic weapons the Federal Republic of Germany, whose

ruling circles openly disagree with the existing European frontiers, can have consequences the gravity of which is, possibly, not realised by some of Western Germany's N.A.T.O. allies, not to mention the fact that it inevitably leads to a dangerous arms race between the European states.

When the western powers concluded the Paris agreements, the Soviet government and the governments of the other countries in the socialist camp gave warning that the drawing of the Federal Republic of Germany into N.A.T.O. would result in the absolutely unrestricted remilitarisation of Western Germany and in the strengthening of the circles seeking for revenge. The western politicians tried to present this warning of ours as "communist propaganda."

Moreover, in order to justify Western Germany's inclusion in N.A.T.O., the ruling circles of the western powers loudly claimed that this would permit them to exercise effective control over the quantitative and qualitative arming of Germany.

In those days western propaganda insisted that the Federal Republic of Germany would under no circumstances be allowed to have atomic weapons.

However, the rulers of the western countries are no longer speaking about this at the present time. On the contrary, the western powers, and above all the United States, are striving to arm Western Germany with atomic weapons. This policy made possible the Bundestag decision to equip the West German armed forces with atomic weapons—a decision approved by the N.A.T.O. allies of the Federal Republic of Germany—and also the United States decision to set up atomic arms depots and American rocket bases on the territory of Western Germany.

Thus, the ruling circles of Western Germany have set foot on the road to preparing an atomic war—a road fraught with serious consequences. In its appeal of March 31 to the Bundestag of the Federal Republic of Germany, the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet justifiably emphasised that the implementation of the

decision to equip the West German army with atomic and rocket weapons, like the planting of foreign atomic and rocket weapons on West German territory, was leading to a situation in Europe resembling the time when Hitler Germany launched preparations for the Second World War. It is not without reason, therefore, that the plans for delivering atomic weapons into the hands of the West German military clique have caused serious alarm and anxiety in many states and among the people, including the population of Western Germany.

One must be blind not to see that the decision of the Bundestag to arm Western Germany with atomic weapons does more than merely widen the split in Germany. The atomic arming of Western Germany would slam the only remaining door to the restoration of the German people's national unity through *rapprochement* and accommodation between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany.

Using the system of military groupings—N.A.T.O., S.E.A.T.O., and the Baghdad Pact—the United States is stationing on the territories of the member-countries special task units equipped with atomic weapons. What is more, officials in the United States and other western countries do not consider it necessary to conceal their plans to employ atomic and hydrogen weapons against the Soviet Union and the other peaceloving states.

Thus, in one of his numerous statements made in 1957, for instance, the supreme commander of the N.A.T.O. armed forces, General Norstad of the United States, said that N.A.T.O. strategy was based on atomic weapons. Distorting the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and ascribing all sorts of intrigues to it, Norstad said that in the event of "Russian aggression" the N.A.T.O. armed forces were ready to use atomic weapons first, even if the Soviet Union declared that it would not employ nuclear weapons. The same idea was reiterated in the British government's recently published White Paper, which openly proclaims Britain's intention of

using nuclear weapons first against the Soviet Union.

The question suggests itself: Did the authors of the White Paper think about where this policy is leading? Did they think what an atomic war could bring to their country?

The United States ruling circles now attach particular importance to the creation of a network of atomic and rocket bases in Europe and other areas of the world, directed against the countries of the socialist camp. It is easy to realise that the very idea of establishing such bases many thousands of kilometres away from the American territories proper has nothing in common either with the interests of the United States' defence or the security of the countries where these bases are situated, but is from beginning to end an expression of an aggressive policy.

As is well known, the signing of an Anglo-American agreement on establishing rocket launching sites in Britain was announced in February. Such an act, which is unpopular in western countries, and especially in Britain herself, cannot, of course, be regarded as an expression of a desire on the part of the governments of the United States and Britain to help to ease international tension.

The leaders of the Atlantic bloc are spreading fabrications of all kinds in order to justify in some way in the eyes of the peoples the organisation of rocket bases on the territories of West European states. An example of these fabrications can be found in the false reports alleging that the Soviet Union has bases for intermediate-range rockets on the territories of the German Democratic Republic, Poland and Czechoslovakia. It can easily be seen that such reports, too, are aimed at worsening international tension for the purpose of continuing the arms race. Is not the intention of the United States to continue the arms race confirmed in President Eisenhower's statement on May 6, to the effect that the United States plans to spend more than 40,000 million dollars a year on armaments for the next 10, 15, and perhaps even 40 years? Certainly it is.

However, such a policy on the part of the United States and other N.A.T.O. countries naturally compels the Warsaw Treaty member-states to draw the appropriate conclusions. However unwilling they were, they might be compelled by circumstances to consider the question of stationing rocket weapons in the German Democratic Republic, Poland and Czechoslovakia. What would this mean for the situation in Europe? It would mean that the distance between rocket installations aimed against each other would become smaller and smaller, which would inevitably increase the danger of an outbreak of war, of a terrible war of extermination.

It is well known that rocket weapons are area weapons, striking at enormous areas and objectives. They are weapons for the mass extermination of human beings and for the destruction of immense material wealth.

It must be hoped that the N.A.T.O. leaders will display sound judgment and will not compel the Warsaw Treaty states to take reciprocal measures with regard to the stationing of rocket weapons.

The United States leaders responsible for American foreign policy obviously hope that the presence of American bases on the territory of European states will ensure that those states are automatically involved in a war which might be unleashed by the United States. These plans which envisage the use of the territories of other states for establishing bases, atomic and hydrogen weapons depots and sites for launching rockets with nuclear warheads, show that the American politicians, at the cost of sacrificing their allies, hope to avert a retaliatory blow from themselves and to protect the territory of the United States of America from the fatal consequences of a nuclear war, or at least to mitigate those consequences.

Some of the United States military leaders do not even consider it necessary to conceal the real purpose of American overseas bases. At the end of last year the N.A.T.O. chief of staff, the American General Schuyler, spoke at

a press conference in Oslo. The gist of his statement was that the principal merit of American bases in Europe was the fact that they were far removed from the United States' vital centres.

As for the European countries on whose territories the American bases are situated, those countries, Schuyler said, should be prepared for the possible use of nuclear weapons against them. Such is the prospect which American atomic strategists hold out for the peoples of Europe!

No wonder that in these conditions the policy of the United States ruling circles is arousing increasing anxiety and mistrust among the United States' N.A.T.O. partners and in other countries on whose territories American bases are being established. It is not by chance that the governments of such countries as Norway and Denmark, displaying a sense of duty and responsibility for the future of their countries, have opposed the establishment of American atomic and rocket weapon launching sites on their territories.

One cannot help feeling surprise at the short-sightedness of the American ruling circles who hope to divert a retaliatory blow from themselves towards their allies in the event of the United States unleashing a nuclear war.

Certain people should not forget that intercontinental ballistic rockets and other modern means of warfare can now hit targets at any point on the globe.

If we are to speak of American bases brought forward close to the frontiers of the states against which these bases are aimed, it would be naive to suppose that only the American side possesses modern means of warfare. The progress of science and technology now gives equal opportunities for highly developed industrial countries to manufacture weapons of the most up-to-date types. Every intelligent person who has some understanding of the progress of science and technology realises clearly that the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty countries can have, and do have, everything necessary so as not

to find themselves in a strategically disadvantageous position.

A very convincing proof of the technical potential of the Warsaw Treaty states is the launching of Soviet artificial earth satellites and the creation of intercontinental rockets.

It is not advisable, therefore, for anyone to proceed from positions of strength, or for either side to frighten the other. The end product of all this is only an arms race, and an arms race, as everyone knows, has eventually always led to war.

Every statesman who is conscious of his responsibility must make a sober appraisal of the situation and, far from doing anything, for his part, which might be likely to make the atmosphere more heated and promote the arms race—and thus tend to bring war nearer, must make it his concern to bring about an end to the "cold war" and work in real earnest towards creating conditions for good-neighbourly relations between all states. We have never failed, nor shall we ever fail, to pursue this goal.

An atmosphere of war hysteria is being maintained by regular flights of American atomic and hydrogen bombers, both over the territory of the United States itself and over that of a number of other countries. Is an atomic war likely to take long in breaking out under such circumstances?

Anyone whose mind is not afflicted by war psychosis shares the feeling of grave alarm and the righteous anger which world opinion feels at the news that an atom bomb was "accidentally" dropped from an American bomber on a small town in the American state of South Carolina, and although the bomb failed to explode, the peoples of the world are posing this legitimate question: What will happen if an incident like that repeats itself and if this time a nuclear explosion, with all its horrible consequences, does occur? What is to prevent the possibility that an accidental explosion of an American atomic or hydrogen bomb on American territory or on that of some other state over which American hydrogen bombers are

flying, may be taken for a surprise attack? There is nothing to guarantee that this will not happen. Thus, an accidental atom bomb explosion may well trigger off another world war.

A wave of indignation has swept all countries at the news that the United States is systematically sending its military aircraft with atomic and hydrogen bombs flying towards the frontiers of the Soviet Union. Such activities on the part of the American military command, which are unprecedented in peacetime, are indeed bringing the world to the brink of an atomic war.

It will be recalled that the Soviet government has emphatically protested against these flights and has brought the matter before the United Nations Security Council. Nevertheless, the United States, far from calling a halt to the provocative flights of its aircraft, attempted to distract the attention of world opinion from the essence of the question raised by the Soviet Union. It proposed that an international inspection system to forestall a sudden attack should be established in the Arctic region over which American planes are flying.

The Soviet government has had occasion to point out that this proposal of the United States does not in any way reduce the threat to world peace represented by the flights of American atom and hydrogen bombers towards the frontiers of the Soviet Union.

The Arctic region is the one through which the shortest air route between the Soviet Union and the United States passes. For this reason it is of great strategic importance, and the flights of American military aircraft with atom and hydrogen bombs over that region are, undoubtedly, a grave threat to peace. It is precisely for this reason that the United States must put an end to such flights of American aircraft towards the Soviet frontiers. Yet the government of the United States is stubbornly refusing to comply with this just demand and to heed the voice of reason.

In addition, the Soviet Union's

security is being jeopardised by the flights of American aircraft, not only across the Arctic region, but also over those areas of Europe, Africa and Asia where the United States maintains an extensive network of air bases.

This being the situation, the American proposal for an Arctic inspection system cannot be of any value to the security of the Soviet Union because, in the first place, while proposing such a system, the United States is not even promising to end such nuclear flights altogether, but only to reduce their number; secondly, this proposal concerns only one stretch of the Soviet Union's frontier. Lastly, the system of inspection under the American proposal is to cover a substantial portion of the territory of the Soviet Union and not one inch of that of the United States proper.

Consequently, the purpose behind the United States proposal is to gain certain military and strategic advantages for the United States at the expense of weakening the security of the Soviet Union. It is simply obvious that no self-respecting state can agree to such a proposal.

Proposals like this indicate only one thing, and this is that the United States of America is persisting in its "policy of strength," for only a state banking on such policy can put forward such proposals. But it is making a mistake, for to every force there is always a counter-force. It is only natural, therefore, that no state, and still less a state possessing all the necessary means of defence, can accept proposals which are advantageous to one side only, like the ones which have been made by the United States.

In an effort to counter in one way or another the pressure of the peoples for an end to the arms drive being carried on by the western powers, the statesmen of the United States, Britain and France often declare that they are compelled to follow this policy because of a threat to the West from the Soviet Union.

Yet, have any of these statesmen been

able to cite even one fact to indicate any activity on the part of the U.S.S.R. which jeopardises the security of any state? No one has ever cited such facts and, indeed, no one can do so, for no such facts exist.

Definite efforts are now being made in the West to justify the policy of speeding up war preparations, including the installation of American atomic bases and rocket launching sites on other people's territory, by alluding to the Soviet Union's development of an intercontinental missile. But it is well known that the United States had begun to set up its military bases outside its own territory long before modern rockets, and especially intercontinental missiles, had been created. It must be recalled in this connection that after the end of the Second World War, the Soviet Union put forward proposals for withdrawing all foreign troops from the territories of other countries and for eliminating all foreign bases set up on the territories of other states. The governments of the United States, Britain and France not only flatly refused to accept that proposal of the Soviet Union but also continued to set up more and more military bases in the vicinity of our frontiers.

Could the Soviet government be expected, in the circumstances, not to display due concern for the security of its own country and not to think of creating dependable means of ensuring that security? No, it could not.

Yet even today, when the Soviet Union is in possession of the intercontinental weapon, we are prepared to come to an agreement to ban the use of outer space for military purposes if the western powers, for their part, agree to dismantle their military bases on foreign territories. It is common knowledge that the Soviet government has proposed the inclusion of that question in the agenda of a summit meeting. It is now up to the western powers, and in the first place the United States.

In stepping up the arms race, the ruling circles of the United States and the other western powers are demanding

ever new sacrifices from their peoples for the sake of expanding war preparations. All this cannot but affect the economic circumstances of the working people, who are forced to bear the heavy burden of military expenditures.

The militarisation of the economy of the western powers has led to a serious disruption of the economy, to a growth of unemployment in those countries and to calamities for millions of people. The supporters of the "positions of strength" policy and the stepping up of the "cold war" have been sparing no pains to inculcate in the minds of the working people that such a policy is in their own interests because it is connected with a rise in military production and therefore, so they allege, leads to more employment in industry.

They go so far as to frighten the working class with the assertion that if the "cold war" were to be terminated and the need for an arms race ceased to exist, this would lead to a drop in production, a growth in the army of unemployed and a fall in the working people's living standards.

Are these arguments used by the opponents of ending the "cold war" and the flunkeys of monopoly capital correct? No, these arguments are erroneous. First and foremost, they are contrary to the essence of human life. They are profoundly anti-humanistic, because they are used to convince man, whose lot it is to engage in creative labour, that he can live only when creating the means of his own destruction.

These arguments also fall to the ground when analysed from the scientific standpoint. Isn't it true that the possibility exists at the present time of organising on a large scale the production of the means of consumption and the means of production instead of the manufacture of the means of destruction? The market for this—both internal and external—is veritably limitless. If the United States, for example, were to cut prices for consumer goods and raise the working people's wages, the purchasing power of the people would sharply increase and this would create

conditions for expanding the production of the means of consumption.

Is it not clear that if the United States were to follow a policy of peaceful co-existence and businesslike co-operation, this would open up vast possibilities for developing the productive forces of the United States? Such countries, for example, as India, People's China, Pakistan, Indonesia, Iran, the countries of the Arab East and the Soviet Union could alone become vast markets consuming enormous quantities of American goods.

This would lead to greater employment and consequently to higher living standards for the American population and would at the same time help to realise the desire of the peoples of other countries to develop and expand their economy, raise their living standards and promote the advance of their national culture.

Under the present "positions of strength" policy, the powers participating in N.A.T.O. have spent a total of more than 400,000 million dollars for military purposes in the period from 1950 to 1957. However, these vast military expenditures have not helped them to evade the mounting difficulties in the economy clearly exemplified by the situation in the United States, which, as the Americans themselves admit, is now undergoing an economic crisis.

Nor has that policy of the United States benefited the countries which support the "cold war" policy and the arms drive. Quite the contrary, by

fettering themselves with the "positions of strength" policy, these countries are forced to shoulder unbearable military expenditures. Their economy is being undermined and civilian production is being curtailed—a fact which allows the American monopolies to place these countries in a position of ever greater dependence, both in the economic and the political sense.

All this shows that the real interests of all countries are not served by the "cold war" policy, but by a policy of peaceful co-existence, mutually advantageous trade and businesslike co-operation.

Needless to say, all the peoples would heave a sigh of relief if the threat of war were eliminated and people everywhere could devote their efforts to creative labour, to raising living standards and developing their culture.

That is precisely what the interests of mankind demand. Every day the peoples are realising ever more clearly the ruinous effects of the arms drive and the "cold war" policy, and it may be said with confidence that the demands of the peoples will triumph and that the peoples will make their governments end the arms race.

It should be noted that at the present time, too, the policy-makers of the western powers cannot fail to reckon with these demands. That is why they pay lip service to peace, although they systematically work to step up the pace of preparations for a new war.

countries parties to the Warsaw Treaty suffered the greatest sacrifices. And we are justified in saying that there are no other states on earth whose governments so insistently and unflinchingly follow the policy of preventing the unleashing of a new war as the governments of the socialist camp states do, expressing the

cherished desires and vital interests of their peoples.

In our time war has ceased to be fatally inevitable. The profoundly abnormal international tension which now prevails can and must be overcome. Peace can and must be preserved.

Like the other governments of the socialist countries, the Soviet government far from believes that the prevailing situation cannot be changed for the better. It will be recalled that in the period of the Second World War, relations of close co-operation existed between the Soviet Union, the United States of America, Britain and the other powers of the anti-Hitler coalition. If this co-operation gave way to relations of mistrust, estrangement and even a measure of hostility, that has occurred in spite of the wishes of the Soviet Union.

The government of the United States, and not only that government, clearly could not stomach friendship with states having social and economic systems differing from that of the United States. In the postwar years, politicians have come to power in the United States of America who have taken it into their heads that the United States can succeed in tilting the balance of forces in its favour and eliminating the socialist system in the people's democracies, a system which the peoples of these countries have themselves set up. Not daring to attack the Soviet Union directly, these politicians have concentrated their efforts against the East European countries, as they call them, trying to make the peoples of these countries swerve off the road they have chosen and embrace the way of life favoured by certain circles in the United States of America.

It is obvious that such calculations are not the result of sound reasoning or a correct evaluation of the situation and correlation of forces in the international arena.

Having set before themselves the fantastic task of eradicating socialism all over the world, these politicians would like to solve that problem stage

by stage, because they lack the means even to dare to hope for something greater. At the same time they continue to act against the world's first socialist state, the Soviet Union, pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into subversive activities against the Soviet Union. They are surrounding the U.S.S.R. with military bases.

Today the failure of the originators of the "positions of strength" policy is patent. The socialist camp has become even more united and powerful, while the United States of America, pursuing such a policy, has largely lost its international prestige by assuming the role of leader of the "cold war" and organiser of military blocs hostile to the cause of peace.

If we turn to considerations of a military nature, it will be found that the American leaders in that sphere have also made considerable miscalculations. This is particularly evident since the launching into outer space of the three Soviet artificial earth satellites, which have demonstrated the high level of industrialisation and of the development of science and engineering in the Soviet Union. Far be it from us, of course, to deny that the United States and other countries with a high level of development in industry, science and technology are able to achieve similar results.

We should like to hope that the leaders of the United States of America, for their part, might take a more sober view of things. A solution of the contradictions dividing the states of the East and the West does not lie in the arms race, but in negotiations between them. It is not sabre-rattling but meetings between responsible statesmen that will lead to a solution of controversial issues.

In the present circumstances, with the "cold war" outgrowths that have been amassed over the years making themselves felt literally at every turn, a daring search and a concerted and determined effort are needed to ensure the turn in international relations which the peoples want and to spare the world the

## Socialist Countries Stand for Ending Arms Race, for Eliminating 'Cold War'

COMRADES, the peoples represented by those taking part in our conference know what war is. They were spared neither by the First World War nor by the second. In both these wars the people of the Soviet Union, the Germans, the Poles, the peoples of Czechoslovakia and other peoples of the

nightmare of a war catastrophe.

The fact that only a conference of the most authoritative and plenipotentiary representatives of states can tackle this task can hardly be disputed. This is precisely why the Soviet Union, upon consulting all the socialist countries, made a proposal last December for a top-level East-West conference.

The Soviet government has done everything in its power to clear the way to a conference at the summit and to create an atmosphere of trust and businesslike co-operation. It is enough to mention the Soviet Union's reduction in its armed forces and its unilateral suspension of all atomic and hydrogen weapon tests. This conference is also considering further steps to be taken by the Warsaw Treaty countries towards relaxing international tension and safeguarding peace in Europe. We have concrete deeds to back our good will for agreement and mutual understanding.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries will continue steadfastly and perseveringly to pursue a policy aimed at easing international tension and ending the "cold war." Every day the peoples will be giving increasing support to this peace policy and will duly appreciate it. We are confident that through hard work we shall eventually bring about a situation in which the peoples of the states whose governments pursue a policy of strength and the arms race will compel their governments to take the road of peaceful co-existence.

The Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty countries are prepared for a summit conference and have forwarded to our partners proposals to this effect. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. is holding preparatory discussions to this end with the Ambassadors of the United States, Great Britain and France in Moscow. But we are finding it increasingly difficult to overcome the conviction that lying behind the talk of the western leaders about the need for careful summit preparations is the lack of desire of the western powers to talk business, although

the governments of these powers must have as much ground for being concerned about easing international tension and removing the rocket and atomic war danger as the countries of the socialist camp have.

The questions we suggest for discussion at the summit meeting are well known. They have been raised and made urgent by life itself. Every one of these proposals, whether it deals with ending nuclear tests, the creation of a zone free of atomic, hydrogen or rocket weapons in Europe, measures for the prevention of a surprise attack, the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and N.A.T.O., or anything else suggested for discussion, has the purpose of contributing to a relaxation of tension in international relations. At the same time every one of them could be put into effect even today, provided only that our partners at the talks guide themselves by the same striving as we guide ourselves: namely, to put an end to the "cold war" and reduce international tension.

We cannot, however, fail to note that the tactics of the United States and the countries supporting it boil down to an attempt to lull the vigilance of the peoples by declarations and by talk about thorough preparations for the summit conference while burying the very idea for good and all. Nor can one fail to see that what lies behind the talk of the need for careful summit preparations is, in point of fact, the intention of certain circles in the West to go ahead with their "positions of strength" policy in order to try to compel the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty countries to accept the United States demands without the least objection, a fact which these circles bluntly admit.

But who, indeed, can take seriously the calculation that as a result of some careful summit preparations the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty countries will agree to an international conference considering such issues as the situation in the East European countries, which constitutes an attempt at interference in the internal affairs of these coun-

tries in order to force a change in the socialist system established by the peoples of these countries? Or take the question of German reunification, as treated by the western powers.

Is it being serious to say that Germany can be reunited, while ignoring the existence of the two sovereign German states, the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany, to say that this can be done without them, behind their backs and in the interests of certain groups in one of these states alone, the Federal Republic of Germany? If the western representatives, in pleading the need for thorough preparations for the meeting, have it in mind to compel the Soviet Union to agree to a discussion of such questions, we must say openly that the time needed for such "preparations" would be unlimited, for never, under no circumstances, will the Soviet Union agree to such a solution.

The Soviet Union has submitted absolutely specific proposals for discussion at a summit meeting. Life itself has dictated them. If the western powers are not yet prepared to consider all of them, would it not be possible to select some of these questions, to reach agreement on them and thereby lay the foundation for a solid edifice of peace?

We consider that such questions should be selected, in preparing for a summit meeting and in preparing questions for discussion at it, as could be resolved now, at this stage. This can be accomplished only if countries with different internal systems, that is, capitalist countries and socialist countries, approach the matter realistically, proceeding from the immutable fact that two world systems—capitalism and socialism—exist on the globe today, and if they recognise the principle of the peaceful co-existence of two systems and tackle questions that would promote this peaceful co-existence.

That is why the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries propose that the summit meeting should consider questions that in no way affect the foundations of the capitalist countries and at the same time do not prejudice the

socialist countries. This is the principal thing, and it is precisely this approach that can make a summit meeting successful.

We propose to the United States of America, Britain and our other partners to try the way of partial disarmament measures. We are not doing this because we consider radical, all-embracing disarmament to be less desirable. On the contrary, the Soviet Union is ready to negotiate it today. But experience of years of long negotiations in the United Nations shows that the western powers reject a radical solution of the disarmament problem.

It appears that not the least of the fears of the governments of the U.S.A. and other western powers is that curtailment of military production would lead to an economic recession in their countries. Our proposals for partial disarmament measures, as a start, take these fears into account, enabling the western powers to convert their industry to peaceful production gradually and painlessly.

The Soviet Union has always considered it its sacred duty to mankind to bring about a ban on the means of mass destruction—atomic and hydrogen weapons.

How can this problem be most speedily approached? Since the western powers say that they cannot agree at present to the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons and their removal from national armaments, we suggest that they take—as a beginning—merely the first step in this direction, and halt their tests, for the continuation of tests poisons the atmosphere by fission products and leads to the development of even more powerful nuclear weapons, weapons even more frightful in their consequences.

Considering that the western powers have turned the question of control into the main stumbling block in the course of disarmament talks, the Soviet Union proposed the establishment of a system of control over the suspension of tests through the establishment of control posts in the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A., Britain and the Pacific. We agreed to this even though we knew that the existing national

scientific institutions are themselves able to detect all nuclear explosions, anywhere in the world, without the aid of any international control system.

But this did not prompt the western powers to agree to a universal suspension of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests. So far, all our proposals have come up against the blank wall of western objections.

Guided by a desire to make a start on the universal suspension of nuclear weapon tests and thereby take the first step towards a complete ban on these weapons, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. passed a decision on the unilateral suspension of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests by the Soviet Union and called on the other countries to follow suit.

It is now obvious that the western powers will not respond to this initiative of the Soviet Union. Towards the end of April the United States and Britain started another series of atomic and hydrogen tests. These nuclear tests show that the ruling circles of the U.S.A. and Britain are sabotaging agreement on an immediate, universal suspension of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests and thereby assume a heavy responsibility for the continuation of the nuclear arms race.

To evade ending nuclear tests, the western powers insist on preliminary work by experts on the technical details of control over the suspension of tests.

The Soviet government holds, as it always has, that it is necessary to agree in principle on the suspension of nuclear tests first and to take up the matter of control over it afterwards. However, wishing to bring closer agreement with the western powers on the suspension of nuclear tests, the Soviet government has agreed to experts being detailed to start work immediately to study the means of detecting possible violations of an agreement on the suspension of nuclear weapon tests. We stressed, however, that this work should be completed in a short period, specified in advance.

These steps of the Soviet government

have paved the way for agreement on the immediate suspension of tests of all types of nuclear weapons. All peoples agree in demanding that the suspension of nuclear weapon tests should be the first item discussed at the summit, and they will not forgive the governments of the United States and Britain if they block the matter of ending nuclear tests tackled so vigorously by the Soviet Union.

Rejection of the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons which the powers have in their armaments would be of great importance for easing international tension and ending the arms race. That this measure is perfectly realistic is obvious to all. It requires neither lengthy talks nor any control or material expenditures. But such moral condemnation of nuclear arms would be of truly inestimable value for the cause of peace, besides creating conditions for further steps towards resolving the disarmament problem.

A moral undertaking by states not to use atomic and hydrogen weapons would be especially significant today when it is no longer possible to establish foolproof control over compliance with an agreement banning nuclear weapons, and when it is easy for either side to start, if it so wishes, the secret manufacture of nuclear weapons. We now have to reckon with the fact that the process of nuclear materials manufacture is the same, whether for military or peaceful purposes. The same nuclear materials can be used both in peaceful branches of production and for the manufacture of nuclear weapons. This means that the manufacture of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, which is becoming increasingly extensive and widespread, can be used, simultaneously, for the secret stockpiling of explosive nuclear materials in circumvention of control. And once enough materials have been stockpiled, it would not be too difficult to hide the designing and manufacture of nuclear bombs and atomic rocket warheads. This can be done by any industrially developed country.

Today, when nuclear arms have ceased to be the monopoly of one state, as was the case 13 years ago, it is very, very dangerous to use these weapons of mass destruction without risking a shattering retaliation. Things must be viewed realistically. Under the present circumstances, the way to eliminate the threat of atomic war is moral condemnation of the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons. Anyone who tries to evade agreement on renouncing the use of nuclear arms is being hypocritical in saying that it could have no force but would remain an uncontrolled moral commitment.

Moral condemnation by the peoples is a great force. It will be a means of rigid control and a containing factor against those planning to use nuclear weapons, those barbaric weapons for the mass annihilation of people and the destruction of material values. The experience of the recent past confirms the significance and effectiveness of international agreements imposing moral obligations on states.

It is common knowledge that the Geneva Protocol of 1925, banning chemical and bacteriological means of warfare, played a positive role, preventing the use of these weapons of mass destruction during the Second World War. The aggressors dared not use these weapons, morally condemned by an international treaty and by world public opinion.

A ban on the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons would be a good beginning. Later, when the relations between states have been developed and extended, when these relations have become relations of friendship, the conditions will arise for broader control and greater international confidence, and this will make it possible to exclude war altogether as a means of settling disputed issues.

A summit meeting should also give the closest consideration to the proposal of the Polish People's Republic for the establishment in Europe of a zone free of atomic, hydrogen and rocket weapons. The Soviet Union, like the other mem-

bers of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, does not seek any military advantages in supporting this proposal. It wants only one thing—to achieve a relaxation of tension in Central Europe and to reduce the likelihood of atomic war in the area and, consequently, help eliminate the threat of such a war in general.

Those who allege that only one side stands to gain from the establishment of such a zone are chopping logic. They deliberately ignore facts which run counter to their contentions.

In what circumstances could the establishment of an atom-free zone—composed, as is proposed, of four countries: Poland, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany—be said to give definite military advantages to the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Treaty partners? Only if N.A.T.O.'s contribution to the establishment of such a zone is greater than that of the Warsaw Treaty countries. In reality, this is far from being the case.

Naturally, simple arithmetical calculations are inapplicable in comparing military and economic factors. But some figures are indisputable.

A comparison of the territories of the states to make up this zone shows that the combined territory of the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia and Poland is more than twice that of the fourth proposed member of the zone, Western Germany. Moreover, the combined population of the Warsaw Treaty countries in the zone is also greater than the population of the sole N.A.T.O. country in it.

It is known that neither the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland, nor the Federal Republic of Germany manufactures its own nuclear weapons. What is more, the government of the Federal Republic of Germany assumed, in its time, an international commitment not to manufacture such weapons in the future. All this shows that there are no grounds for supposing that the establishment of a zone free of atomic, hydrogen and rocket weapons

would give any military advantages to the Warsaw Treaty countries at the expense of the N.A.T.O. countries.

If the western powers fear that following the establishment of this zone the Soviet Union will retain in it a superiority in conventional arms, one might ask why they reject the Soviet proposals for reducing the strength of foreign troops on the territory of Germany and other European states.

To our mind, it would be hardly correct to preclude in advance the possibility that the establishment of a zone free of nuclear and rocket weapons would be accompanied by measures for the reduction and mutually acceptable adjustment of the strength of foreign troops now kept on the territory of states which may form part of the proposed zone.

The establishment of a zone free of nuclear and rocket weapons would not only be of great international significance, but would also go a long way towards ensuring the security of the states which would belong to it. We find it difficult, therefore, to understand the position of the government of the Federal Republic of Germany, whose attitude to the Polish proposal has so far been negative.

The Soviet government has already announced its readiness to undertake to respect the status of the zone free of nuclear and rocket weapons and to regard the territory of the countries in it as excluded from the application of nuclear and rocket weapons, if the governments of the U.S.A., Britain and France do likewise.

The Soviet government recently made another concession to the western powers by proposing the conclusion of a broad international agreement on banning the use of outer space for military purposes and closing down military bases on foreign territories, and on international co-operation in the study of outer space.

The rapid scientific and technical progress in the development of rockets capable of reaching out into cosmic space places a grave responsibility on the states. Their duty is to channel pro-

gress in this field to peaceful uses, so that intercontinental and all other rockets may be used not for destruction but for peaceful research, for conquering the great expanses of the universe.

The Soviet Union has proposed the establishment of a United Nations agency on international co-operation in the study of outer space with a view to making the new scientific discoveries serve the peaceful needs of mankind. The Soviet proposals, considering as they do the security interests of all states in equal measure, make it possible to provide a really solid foundation for international co-operation. They are, at the same time, a major step towards solving the problem of disarmament in general.

The United States approaches the question of outer space from different positions. It limits its proposals to control over intercontinental missiles, leaving aside the question of other rockets which may carry nuclear warheads, and also the question of overseas bases suitable for the launching of such rockets and for accommodating warplanes carrying atom and hydrogen bombs.

One cannot fail to see that the United States, in limiting its proposals to a ban on intercontinental ballistic missiles, wants to safeguard itself against atomic retaliation through outer space in case of atomic war, retaining the while its numerous military bases on foreign territories, intended for an attack on the Soviet Union and the peaceable countries friendly to it.

It goes without saying that the Soviet government cannot agree to the security of the Soviet Union and the countries friendly to it being placed in jeopardy.

The task of ensuring to the maximum the security of all states requires that a ban on the military use of outer space be accompanied by measures for the closing down of military bases on the territory of other states, and primarily in Europe, the Middle East and North Africa.

Discussion at the summit of other questions listed in the well-known Soviet proposals would also be of great import-

ance for the relaxation of international tension.

However, the western reaction to them cannot so far be regarded as encouraging.

In their efforts to prevent the holding of a summit conference, certain circles in the West would like to do some bargaining, as it were, making out that the Soviet Union has some special interest in the questions submitted by the Soviet government for consideration at the summit. Therefore, they argue, if we drive a hard bargain with the Soviet Union, we can wrest, in exchange for our consent to take part in the meeting, some advantages at the expense

of unilateral concessions by the socialist states.

The western demands for a discussion of matters which mean interference in the internal affairs of the socialist states cannot be regarded in any other way than as provocations designed to stir up enmity between states.

It is time for the western powers to realise that the question of the government system of the people's democracies, as of any other sovereign state, is not a matter for discussion at international conferences, for it has long been settled by the peoples of these countries, who have taken firmly and unequivocally to the road of building socialism.

## *Conclusion of a Non-Aggression Pact between Member-Countries of Warsaw Treaty and NATO Countries — an Effective Step towards Consolidation of Peace*

COMRADES, the efforts made by the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist camp to achieve a relaxation in international tension, to make a start on disarmament, to halt the tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons, and to reduce armed forces and conventional armaments have been warmly received, as you know, by all the peoples of the world.

The Soviet Union has demonstrated by deeds its peacefulness and its sincere desire to provide conditions for a firm and lasting peace. The Soviet government, without awaiting an international agreement on disarmament, has repeatedly reduced its forces, unilaterally, in recent years. In 1955 it reduced them by 640,000 men, and in 1956-57 by another 1,200,000. At present, a further reduction, by 300,000, is nearing completion, with considerable cuts effected in our troops temporarily stationed under existing agreements in

the German Democratic Republic and Hungary.

Our country's armaments, military equipment and military expenditures for defence have been reduced accordingly.

The other member-countries of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation reduced their armed forces by a total of over 337,000 in the course of 1955-57.

We all give due recognition to the great contribution made to the maintenance of peace by the great Chinese People's Republic, which recently decided to withdraw the Chinese Volunteers from Korea. If the United States followed the example of People's China and withdrew its troops from South Korea and dismantled all its bases there, this would unquestionably help to strengthen peace in the Far East and to adjust the Korean problem.

In discussing the convening of the Political Consultative Committee, the parties to the Warsaw Treaty agreed on

the questions to be considered by our meeting.

The Soviet government considers it desirable for our meeting to go on record for the further unilateral reduction of the armed forces of the Warsaw Treaty countries and to call on the N.A.T.O. countries to effect a similar reduction.

Following consultations with the government of the Rumanian People's Republic, the Soviet government submits to the meeting the question of withdrawing the Soviet troops stationed on the territory of the Rumanian People's Republic under the terms of the Warsaw Treaty, as another measure designed to ease international tension.

The Soviet government favours the withdrawal of all foreign troops from the territories of other states and the closing down of all military bases on foreign territories. Considering western objections to the proposal for the complete withdrawal of troops from foreign territories, the Soviet government has proposed to the western powers to agree—as a beginning—at least on a reduction of their troops on these territories. But this proposal, too, is opposed by the United States and its N.A.T.O. partners.

Recognising the importance that the withdrawal of foreign troops from European states would have for improving the international climate, the Soviet government considers it necessary, in the present situation, to make new efforts, to do everything to impel the western powers to effect such a measure. This is the aim pursued by the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from the Rumanian People's Republic. This step of the Soviet Union could make a start on the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territories of other states and clear the way for agreement on this matter between all countries concerned.

The peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states day by day enjoys the growing support of all the peoples of the world.

In the opinion of the Soviet govern-

ment, the easing of tension in the relations between the countries which are parties to the Warsaw Treaty and the countries belonging to N.A.T.O. would be of paramount importance under the present circumstances. No one can deny that the friction and mistrust engendered by membership of N.A.T.O. and the Warsaw Treaty by the 23 economically and militarily most developed countries is having a deleterious effect on the entire range of international relations.

The conclusion of a non-aggression pact between these two groupings would help remove the edge in the relations between them. After all, it is clear to everyone that a new major war can only be produced by a conflict between the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and N.A.T.O. If, on the other hand, their military machines are not put into motion, such a war, too, would not take place.

Very important also is the fact that a non-aggression pledge is an effective antidote to aggression, since violation of it, as shown by history, leads to the isolation of the aggressor internationally, facilitating the rallying of forces opposed to aggression and, thereby, to the aggressor's defeat.

The Soviet government regards as a favourable factor the pronouncements by certain N.A.T.O. statesmen that a non-aggression pact could be useful and could serve the interests of peace. In this connection, mention can be made of the well-known statement made on the subject by the Prime Minister of Britain, Mr. Macmillan.

The Soviet government considers that it would be useful for those taking part in the present meeting to approach the N.A.T.O. countries with a proposal for the conclusion of a pact of non-aggression between members of that bloc and the countries belonging to the Warsaw Treaty Organisation.

At the same time, one could inform the N.A.T.O. member-states that the Warsaw Treaty Organisation is willing to delegate representatives at any time for an exchange of opinion on questions

arising from the proposal concerning the conclusion of a non-aggression pact. Such an exchange of opinion between representatives of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and the North Atlantic Alliance could take place immediately.

Many western statesmen cannot stomach the fact that the socialist countries hold the initiative in international affairs, that they are making proposals which are popular with the peoples. One might ask why our countries should not take such initiative if it accords with the vital interests of all peoples, including the peoples of the member-states of the western powers' military blocs, and why we should worry if our peace initiative deprives of their sleep those who are interested in the arms race and are haunted by the fear of losing their profits!

Every peace offer by the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and the other socialist countries enlists new friends for us abroad, gives fresh vigour to the powerful peace movement.

In our era international developments are determined by the progress and results of the competition between two antagonistic social systems—socialism and capitalism. The bigger the successes achieved by the working peoples of the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and the other socialist countries in the expansion of industry, the improvement of technology, the rise in the productivity of agriculture and the advance in the material and cultural standards, the stronger become the forces of peace, the more distant becomes the danger of another war. We sincerely rejoice in the tremendous successes of our friends, the peoples building socialism.

It has been proved conclusively that socialism, in emancipating labour, sets free the inexhaustible forces of the peoples, gives unbounded scope for the peoples' creative endeavour, for the genuine blossoming of science and culture, for the realisation of man's most daring plans. The experience of life of the peoples bears out that socialism as a social system is superior to capitalism.

It ensures the development of the productive forces at a pace unprecedented and unattainable for capitalism, ensures the steady advance of the material and cultural standards of the working peoples.

We say to the capitalist countries: Let us compete in the manufacture of goods and articles which the peoples need to make their life more joyous and fuller, let us compete in advancing the living standards and well-being of the peoples. And let the peoples themselves decide during this competition for man's benefit which road is more in keeping with their interests.

The socialist states are not afraid of peaceful competition with the capitalist countries, for they are deeply confident of its outcome.

A firm guarantee of the national independence and sovereignty of each socialist country is the close cohesion of the socialist states, united in a single camp on the basis of the principles of fraternal mutual assistance and proletarian internationalism, full equality, respect for one another's territorial integrity, national independence and sovereignty, non-interference in one another's internal affairs. The solidarity of the socialist states is not directed against any other countries but serves the interests of all peoples by containing the aggressive tendency of the imperialist circles and supporting the steadily growing forces of peace and progress.

Comrades, the questions under discussion at our meeting make it quite clear that we have assembled here not to draft new plans for intensifying the arms race. Unlike N.A.T.O. and other aggressive military blocs of the western powers, the Warsaw Treaty has been concluded exclusively with the object of safeguarding the security of our countries and serves the interests of strengthening peace. The states which are parties to this treaty have never intended, nor do they intend, to attack anyone.

At the same time, we must draw correct conclusions from the fact that the N.A.T.O. countries reply to our measures for reducing armed forces and arms ex-

penditures, to our proposals for easing international tension, by increasing their forces and their military budgets and by stockpiling armaments.

All this is being done to prevent a relaxation in international tension and the achievement of agreement between the states that would ensure their peaceful co-existence, thus spurring on the Warsaw Treaty countries to take part in the arms race and in the "cold war" in order to retard our peaceful construction.

In taking new steps in this situation to end the "cold war," to reduce armed forces and to provide conditions for peaceful co-existence, we must have a sober approach to and display a sense of responsibility for the security of our socialist countries.

The governments of the countries which are parties to the Warsaw Treaty cannot allow a situation to arise in which the vigilance of our peoples would be

lulled and conditions would arise in which the "positions of strength" champions might yield to the temptation of using force against the socialist countries. This means that in fighting consistently for the easing of international tension we should in no way forget the necessity of safeguarding the peaceful labour of the peoples of the socialist countries against any encroachment by the forces of aggression.

Let the governments of the countries relying on the policy of strength know that war against the socialist countries can end in only one way—in the death of the aggressor.

The Soviet government is confident that our conference will successfully accomplish the task set, that it will take decisions that will promote the strengthening of peace and will make a new contribution to an early settlement of the pressing international problems which are agitating mankind.

## Communique on the

# Conference of Representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties

*The meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the member-countries of the Economic Mutual Assistance Council issued the following communique when it ended in Moscow on May 23:*

**A CONFERENCE of representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the member-countries of the Economic Mutual Assistance Council met in Moscow from May 20 to 23, 1958.**

It was attended by representatives of the Albanian Party of Labour, the Bulgarian Communist Party, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, the Polish United Workers' Party, the Rumanian Workers' Party, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. Representatives from the Viet Nameese Party of Labour, the Communist Party of China, the Korean Party of Labour and the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party were also invited to take part in the conference.

The conference considered the further promotion of economic co-operation between the socialist countries on the basis of the consistent implementation of the principle of international socialist division of labour and rational industrial specialisation and co-ordination, and heard reports on the work of the government planning agencies of the socialist countries in drawing up long-term plans for the basic sections of the national economy.

The members of the conference were unanimous in noting that economic contacts between the socialist countries were steadily being consolidated and were acquiring an increasingly many-sided character. Considerable progress has been made in recent years, in specialisation

and co-ordination of production, notably in machine-building.

The Economic Mutual Assistance Council and its standing committees have carried out a considerable amount of work in preparing recommendations in connection with the drafting of long-term plans for the development of the economy of the socialist countries.

The many-sided co-operation among the socialist countries, founded on the principles of complete equality, respect for one another's national interests and socialist inter-assistance, serves the cause of building socialism and communism and makes it possible to use to the full the advantages of the world socialist system of economy for developing the productive forces of every socialist country individually and for strengthening the economic might of the socialist camp as a whole.

The conference holds that now that the economic ties among the socialist countries have been considerably strengthened and have become all-embracing, it is becoming particularly important further to develop and improve the forms of economic co-operation among them, further to specialise and co-ordinate the production in the inter-related branches of national economy of the countries of the socialist camp.

The correct organisation of co-ordination and specialisation in production within the socialist camp ensures an economy of material resources and a rise in the productivity of social labour, the most rational use of the natural resources and the economic conditions in the socialist countries for speeding up the expansion of socialist reproduction. The conference drew attention to the need for the utmost development of the raw material branches of the national economy and the power industry and for

the further development and introduction of new machinery and techniques. Particular attention was drawn to the necessity of further co-ordination and specialisation in machine-building, making it possible to go over to the more rational mass and serial production, which sharply reduces production expenditures per unit of output.

The representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties unanimously reaffirmed the need for the utmost utilisation of the vast possibilities and the greatest possible consideration for the interests of all socialist countries in the preparation of long-term plans, and also for expanding the mutually advantageous forms of co-operation with a view to raising the level of industrialisation in countries with a less developed industry.

The conference found it necessary further to enhance the role of the Economic Mutual Assistance Council and its agencies in the organisation of economic co-operation.

The conference worked out and ap-

proved agreed recommendations on the further development of economic co-operation among the socialist countries, the co-ordination and specialisation of production, and on the preparation of long-term national economic development plans. The conference decided to refer these recommendations to the Economic Mutual Assistance Council for the elaboration of the required practical measures.

The representatives of parties of the countries which do not belong to the Economic Mutual Assistance Council expressed readiness to take an active part in the economic co-operation of the socialist countries and to strengthen this co-operation in due form by measures conforming to the specific conditions in their countries.

The discussion of the questions on the conference's agenda took place in a friendly and cordial atmosphere, in the spirit of fraternal mutual understanding, and revealed the complete community of views of the parties represented on all the questions discussed.

*Read also:—*

## **EFFORTS OF THE SOVIET UNION TOWARDS SUMMIT TALKS**

*Soviet News Booklet No. 29 2/-*

This is a collection of 32 statements, messages and interviews, covering the period January to May, 1958

*from bookshops, or post free from  
SOVIET NEWS, 3 Rosary Gardens, London, S.W.7*