

Third  
Session of the  
Supreme Soviet  
of the U.S.S.R.

October 31st, 1959

**N. S.  
KHRUSHCHOV**

**Report on the  
International  
Situation  
and the  
Foreign Policy  
of the  
Soviet Union**

1959

and  
**An Appeal to the  
Parliaments of All  
Countries**

**6<sup>d</sup>**  
Soviet  
Booklet  
No. 61

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>



THE  
INTERNATIONAL SITUATION  
and the  
FOREIGN POLICY OF THE  
SOVIET UNION

Report of N. S. KHRUSHCHOV  
to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.  
31st October, 1959

*and*

APPEAL BY THE U.S.S.R. SUPREME SOVIET  
TO THE PARLIAMENTS OF ALL COUNTRIES

## ***THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE U.S.S.R.***

### ***Nikita Khrushchov's Report to the Third Session of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet Session on October 31, 1959***

COMRADES Deputies, the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. have instructed me to report to you on questions concerning the international situation and the foreign policy of the Soviet Union.

The Government of the Soviet Union, guiding itself by the Leninist policy of peace, the decisions of the Twentieth and Twenty-First Party Congresses and the directives of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., have consistently and persistently pursued a policy aimed at easing international tension and ending the cold war, a policy aimed at improving the relations between states for the consolidation of peace and the security of the peoples.

We may note with a sense of satisfaction that thanks to the efforts of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and of all the peace-loving forces, there has lately been a noticeable improvement in the international situation. The main thing is that the tension in the relations between states has been noticeably eased and that prospects for strengthening peace throughout the world have become more favourable.

Yet only recently the passions aroused by the cold war were so great that even a small spark could have produced a world conflagration. The foreign policy of some Western Powers was built on openly aggressive calculations, on the "positions of strength" policy. The inspirers of this policy wanted to impose their will on the peaceloving peoples, to solve international problems with the help of a big stick.

Sometimes this approach to international affairs was styled a "policy of liberation", sometimes a "policy of pushing back" or "rolling back", but the essence remained the same. For to "liberate" from something someone who does not ask for and does not want such "liberation" is to impose one's order on others by force.

No people have yet asked and never will ask Messrs. Capitalists to "liberate" them from the socialist system, whose advantages and benefits they have already tasted, and to revert them to the system of capitalist exploitation. And no people who have liberated themselves from capitalist exploitation have ever expressed the wish to be "liberated" from their own factories and mills, from their right to dispose of the entire wealth of their state, from the right to arrange their life as they want. No free people have ever yet wanted their life to be controlled by a handful of those who rob them, who appropriate the fruits of the people's labour. But

those circles in some countries who still live by exploiting the people apparently do not want to understand this.

When these people spoke of "pushing back" or "rolling back" they meant something different from asking someone politely to move over, to make room. They meant direct military intervention in the affairs of the socialist and other peaceable states. From this stemmed the policy of a continuous arms race, illusory hopes of building up "nuclear supremacy" and so on. All this affected also the terminology of the advocates of this policy. They spoke of a "brinkmanship," of "massive retaliation," and the like. They went so far as openly to threaten "preventive" war against the Soviet Union and other socialist states.

Now the times have changed. Even some of the active exponents of the "positions of strength" policy see its futility. Only the most belligerent western politicians cannot make up their mind to discard the old formula. In some places one still hears reverberations of the past. Take, for instance, the much to be regretted decision of the American Congress to hold a so-called "captive nations' week" and to pray for their liberation. In this case words other than "rolling back" were used, but the gist remained the same, the same appeal for interference in other people's affairs.

So you will see from the policy of "rolling back" that they have switched to praying to the Lord. What can it lead to? If the western leaders pray to God to "liberate" the peoples of the socialist countries and we, in our turn, pray that He should liberate their peoples from capitalist rule, we shall thus put God in a quandary. What decision should He take, after all? It is clear that if He sides with the majority of peoples and takes a democratic position, the decision will be in our favour, in favour of socialism! But this is, so to say, a digression from the gist of the report.

At the present time a more sober evaluation of the situation, a more reasonable understanding of the balance of forces on the international scene is gaining ascendancy in the West. And such an understanding inevitably leads to the conclusion that plans involving the use of armed force against the socialist world should be relegated to oblivion. Life itself demands that states with different social systems should know how to live together on our planet, how to co-exist peacefully.

What are the main reasons for the recent changes in the international atmosphere?

The main reason lies in the growing might and international influence of the Soviet Union, of all countries of the world system of socialism. Mankind is fortunate in that in our time of great scientific discoveries and technical achievements the socialist system appeared in the world and is rapidly developing, since the desire for peace is organically inherent in socialism. And the quicker the forces of the socialist countries grow, the greater are the possibilities for preserving and consolidating peace.

At the same time on the international scene an increasingly greater role is being played by countries which have freed themselves from colonial dependence, as well as by other countries vitally interested in maintaining peace and preventing new wars. In our times the voice of these countries, situated on all continents of the globe, cannot be left

unheeded. Even in the capitalist countries themselves peace-loving forces which stand for ending the cold war and for peaceful international co-operation are in recent times exerting an ever increasing influence.

Finally, ever wider public circles, including many statesmen of capitalist countries, are beginning to realise that in the present conditions, with the existence of nuclear and rocket weapons, war threatens unparalleled loss of human life and destruction, in the first place to the countries that would dare to let loose a new world war.

#### Peaceful Co-existence—Imperative Demand of Life

By their peaceful policy the Soviet Union and all the socialist countries have opened to mankind the road of social development without wars, on the basis of peaceful co-operation.

In our times the outstanding significance of the wisdom of the great Lenin's idea of peaceful co-existence is becoming increasingly clear to the peoples of the whole world.

With the present balance of forces on the whole scene, with the level attained by military techniques, no one except those who are entirely out of touch with realities can suggest any road of development of relations between states with different social systems other than the road of peaceful co-existence.

Not infrequently one hears western leaders discoursing whether the Soviet Union's proposals to co-exist peacefully should be "accepted" or "not be accepted". Such talk in my opinion indicates a failure to understand the crux of the matter. The point is that peaceful co-existence in our days is a real fact and not anyone's request or wish. It is an objective necessity following from the present world situation, from the present phase of development of human society. Both the main social systems now existing on the earth possess weapons which would cause fatal consequences were they brought into action. Those who declare now their non-recognition of peaceful co-existence and argue against it are actually advocating war.

Now the question is not whether we should have peaceful co-existence or not. We have it and we shall have it if we are set against the madness of a world nuclear-missile war. The point is that we must co-exist on a reasonable foundation. One can hardly regard as reasonable the fact that nations are living in conditions in which although there is no war, guns and rockets are all the time at the ready, when military aircraft carrying atom and hydrogen bombs are continually flying above. And it is a fact that these aircraft not only fly but sometimes crash, together with their lethal cargoes, as a result of various accidents. There have been a few such cases in the United States. The fact alone that such cases do occur shows how dangerous it is to stockpile such weapons and to play with them.

The Soviet Government and the entire Soviet people proceed from the Leninist principle of co-existence of states with different social systems and are doing everything in their power to ensure a lasting peace on earth. We do not want people, when they go to bed, to think that it might be their last peaceful night, that a military catastrophe can break out at any moment. We want peaceful co-existence on a reasonable foundation; we want state agencies and public organisations to work in that direc-

tion and to create conditions for co-operation between nations. This co-operation must be based on the principle according to which every country chooses for itself and borrows from its neighbour what that country itself finds necessary, without anything being imposed upon it. Only then will co-existence be truly peaceful and good-neighbourly.

Naturally, such co-existence between states with different social systems is based upon the assumption of mutual concessions in the interests of peace. One might say that this calls for a realistic approach, for a sober assessment of the state of affairs, for mutual understanding and for taking into consideration each other's interests. This is a principled but at the same time a flexible position in the struggle for the preservation of peace.

Recognition of the existence of different systems, recognition of the right of every people to settle independently all the political and social problems of their country, respect for sovereignty and adherence to the principle of non-interference in internal affairs, the settlement of international questions by negotiation—this is what co-existence on a reasonable foundation implies.

The principles of peaceful co-existence were well formulated at the Bandung Conference and later on were also approved by the United Nations. To put it plainly, peaceful co-existence means that states must meet each other half-way in the interests of peace.

Peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems in itself implies elements of mutual concessions, mutual consideration of interests, since otherwise normal relations between states cannot be established.

In ideological matters we have stood and shall continue to stand adamantly on the foundation of Marxism-Leninism. Ideological questions cannot be decided by force; it is impossible to impose the ruling ideology of one state on another state. No sober-minded person has ever considered that ideological disputes or questions of the government system of one country or another should be settled by war.

Capitalists do not approve of the socialist social system. Our ideology, our world outlook are alien to them. We, citizens of the socialist states, equally disapprove of the capitalist order and bourgeois ideology. But we must live peacefully, resolving the international problems that arise by peaceful means only. Hence the need for reciprocal concessions.

Naturally, neither side will yield on basic social questions, questions of ideology, which divide them. I mean concessions of a different kind. For instance, we receive visits from representatives of capitalist states who express their views in statements made in our country. We do not always agree with everything they say, but we tolerate such things. When we visit capitalist countries, we also make speeches and frankly express our views, and this, too, seems to be tolerated.

The principle of peaceful co-existence between states with different social systems means non-interference in one another's internal affairs, a need for reciprocal concessions and compromises, accommodation, if you like, on the part of both sides in the sphere of relations between states in solving pressing practical issues for the preservation and consolidation of peace. V. I. Lenin taught us that the working class, both before and after winning power, must be able to pursue a flexible policy,

to consent to compromises, to agreements, when it is required by life, by the interests of their cause.

What does this mean as applied to present-day conditions? Take the disarmament problem, for example. The Soviet Government has submitted a proposal for general and complete disarmament. We consider that its implementation would ensure peace to all peoples. But we are prepared to consider other proposals as well to achieve a mutually acceptable solution of the disarmament problem. This is a concrete instance of our readiness to make concessions when there is as yet no possibility of settling the problem as a whole, that is to say, of doing as we think best.

On the other hand, capitalist states, too, make certain concessions. It will be recalled, for instance, that they recognised our Soviet state and then the majority of other socialist countries, even though the capitalist ruling circles are opponents of socialism. They have diplomatic relations with socialist countries, they negotiate with them, they take part together and discuss international problems with them in the United Nations. These also are concessions, of course, adaptation, if you like, on the part of the capitalist states, which are obliged to take account of the fact that countries of the world socialist system exist and develop.

When we speak of peaceful co-existence between socialist and capitalist states we mean that neither of them should interfere in the other's internal affairs. It is only on this reasonable foundation that peaceful co-existence is possible.

In the relations between states with different social systems not a few questions are encountered today, and will be encountered in the future, on which it is necessary to meet each other half-way, to press for agreement on a mutually acceptable basis in order to prevent the development of tension and utilise every, even the smallest, opportunity of averting a new war.

But we should not confuse reciprocal concessions for the sake of peaceful co-existence with concessions in matters of principle, in what concerns the very nature of our socialist state, our ideology. In this case there can be no question of any concessions or any adaptation. Concessions on matters of principle, questions of ideology, would mean back-sliding to the positions of our opponents. This would mean a qualitative change in policy, a betrayal of the cause of the working class. Those embarking on this road take the road of treason to the cause of socialism and, of course, must be criticised without mercy.

We are confident of the force of our truth; we carry this socialist truth, the advantages of socialism, high aloft for the whole world to see. We do not have to fear that people of the socialist countries will be tempted by the capitalist devil and will renounce socialism. To think otherwise is not to believe in the strength of socialism, in the strength of the working class and its creative abilities.

The history of the Soviet state offers many examples of Lenin's wise and flexible foreign policy aimed at the solution of the key problems of peace. So it was in the Brest Peace period. Vladimir Ilyich Lenin set the task of concluding peace with Germany to give the young Soviet state an opportunity of peacefully building socialism. Lenin and the party

had to fight hard against Trotsky, who raised leftist objections at the time and put forward his notorious slogan of "Neither peace nor war," thus playing into the hands of the German imperialists. It is a matter of record that Trotsky's adventurist position was utilised by German imperialism against the Soviet country. The young socialist state had to overcome considerable difficulties. Such were the fruits of adventurism in politics.

Today, of course, the situation is entirely different, and I quote this example from history only to show Lenin's principled position in foreign policy and his flexibility in implementing it.

Some bourgeois leaders, opposing peaceful co-existence, accuse the socialist countries, and primarily the Soviet Union, of being insincere in speaking of peaceful co-existence. It is said that we advance the slogan of peaceful co-existence only from temporary, tactical considerations because, they say, Marxism-Leninism proceeds from the proposition that war is necessary for the victory of socialism.

But these assertions are nothing but a distortion of the essence of Marxism-Leninism. Marxism has always waged an implacable struggle against militarism and never has regarded war between states as necessary for the victory of the working class. The most implacable and consistent struggle against predatory wars was waged by the Russian bolsheviks led by Lenin. Recollect also such noted leaders of the working class movement as August Bebel, Jean Jaurès and Karl Liebknecht, who were active fighters against militarism and war. Jaurès paid with his life for his tireless work against the imperialist war of 1914.

We communists know that war is paid for by the working class, the toiling peasantry, by the whole of the working people, with their blood, while capitalists wax rich on wars. But the communists said at the same time: if the contradictions of capitalism have led to a predatory war for redividing the world, the working class, the people, cannot remain indifferent. The First World War was an imperialist war for a redivision of the world. The working class, according to Leninism, had to utilise this war in its interests, turn the imperialist war into civil war, seize power and create a state where the working class, the working people, would be the master, and then halt the war, and work to make predatory wars altogether impossible.

The brilliant example of the practical application of these Leninist propositions by the Bolshevik Party during the First World War is known to all the world. Precisely the bolsheviks, immediately after the establishment of Soviet power, addressed all belligerents with an appeal to end the war and conclude a peace treaty. The Second World War was also unleashed by imperialist states for the purpose of seizing foreign territories, for the purpose of redividing the world. After the defeat of Hitler Germany, fascist Italy and militarist Japan, great changes occurred in the world. Many countries of Europe and Asia broke away from the capitalist system and established the system of people's democracy, the socialist system.

Thus history shows that wars were unleashed, not by communists, but by imperialists.

When we speak about peaceful co-existence we do so sincerely inasmuch as peaceful co-existence is the unshakable foundation of the foreign policy of the Soviet state. As for the social system of one country or another, that is an internal affair of its people. We strictly abide by the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other states.

The policy of peaceful co-existence of states invariably followed by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries is now meeting increasing understanding in the West. Some headway is being made by such forms of East-West relations, which the Soviet Government has long since persistently championed, as negotiations on international problems awaiting solution, exchange of visits by statesmen, mutually profitable economic ties, and cultural and scientific contacts.

And if now it is clear to all that a thaw is beginning in international relations, this of course in many respects is due to the efforts of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Only within the last year and a half, that is to say, during the time the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers has been working in its present composition, the Soviet Government has advanced such important proposals as those for ending nuclear tests; for setting up atom-free zones; for doing away with the remnants of the Second World War by signing a peace treaty with Germany; for calling a meeting of heads of government to consider the most pressing international questions; and the proposal for general and complete disarmament.

The Soviet Government's efforts have already yielded certain positive results. For instance, negotiations are now in progress on a nuclear test ban. True, these negotiations are dragging out, but nevertheless definite progress has been made in them and it is to be hoped that they will be successfully completed shortly. You will recall that a conference of Foreign Ministers was called in Geneva to discuss the problem of doing away with the remnants of the Second World War, and although the conference did not bring about a solution of the problems it discussed it helped to clarify the positions of the sides and reduce the gulf between them and had a positive significance on the whole.

The Soviet Government has undertaken a number of steps to improve relations with the biggest Western powers—the United States, Britain and France. This year's visits by Comrades A. I. Mikoyan and F. R. Kozlov to the United States, followed by the visit by the United States Vice-President, Mr. Nixon, to Moscow and the exchange of exhibitions—the Soviet exhibition in New York and the American exhibition in Moscow—helped to improve Soviet-American relations. The first cracks appeared in the ice of the cold war.

The exchange of views with the British Prime Minister, Mr. Macmillan, during his visit to the U.S.S.R. played a noticeable part both in improving Anglo-Soviet relations and in clearing the general international atmosphere.

An especially important and far-reaching step towards a radical improvement in relations between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. and a general relaxation in international tension was the agreement on the exchange of visits between the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. and the President of the United States.



During the visit to the United States I had meetings and discussions with President Eisenhower and also with other statesmen, and with representatives of most diverse circles and ordinary people of America. These meetings and talks convinced me that the vast majority of the American people do not want war and do want an improvement in relations between our countries. Many prominent United States leaders, with the President at their head, understand these sentiments of the American people, are worried by the situation which has arisen as a result of the arms race and the cold war, and want to find ways to strengthen peace.

For our part we tried to bring home, both to those representatives of various circles in the United States whom we met directly and to the American people as a whole, that the Government of the Soviet Union and the entire Soviet people sincerely want peace and seek to improve relations between the U.S.S.R. and the United States. It seems that we have succeeded in that to a degree and that the position of the Soviet Union is now meeting with more understanding in the United States.

You know that during my meetings with President Eisenhower we exchanged views on a number of major international problems, such as, for instance, universal disarmament, the question of a peace treaty with Germany, the Berlin question and others, and also on the development of Soviet-American relations. The results of the exchange of views are reflected in the joint Soviet-American communiqué. I should only like to add that our discussions were extremely useful and in our view were conducive to a certain mutual understanding, to an approximation of viewpoints in assessing the present situation as a whole, in the approach to certain specific questions of major importance, and to the realisation of the need to improve relations between the U.S.S.R. and the United States.

This is a substantial contribution to the cause of consolidating universal peace and we prize it highly.

You are aware that recently an agreement has been reached on my meeting the President of the French Republic, General de Gaulle. We believe that the meeting will be useful for the development of relations between the U.S.S.R. and France, for the strengthening of world peace.

On the whole our relations with France are following a normal course, although France's participation in military blocs directed against us puts a certain imprint on her policy.

Objectively, the interests of our states do not conflict anywhere and one cannot, of course, consider as accidental the fact that we were allies in both world wars. Naturally, the position of our countries on certain questions are affected by a different understanding of the existing situation. This difference, however, does not seem to be fundamental but one which it is fully possible to surmount. The Soviet people would like to live in peace and friendship with the French people; they wish France prosperity and greatness. Taking a long-term view, I do not see any hitches or obstacles which could seriously interfere with good and friendly relations between our country and the French Republic.

I should like to declare from the high forum of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. that we highly appreciate the realistic pronouncements of President de Gaulle and Prime Minister Debré about the immutability

of the Oder-Neisse frontier. This unquestionably helps to consolidate peace in Europe.

Naturally, the Soviet people, in common with other peace-loving peoples of the world, are perturbed by the war which has been going on in Algeria for five years already. The recent proposals of President de Gaulle for solving the Algerian problem on the basis of self-determination by means of a popular vote in Algeria could play an important role in the settlement of the Algerian question. They will play such a role if they do not remain a mere declaration, if they are supplemented by real steps which, taking into account the rights of the population of Algeria to free and independent development, would at the same time ensure that the mutual interests of both sides are adhered to.

It is known that France and Algeria are linked by close historically developed ties. Naturally, if these ties in the future are built on a new, mutually acceptable basis with genuine observance of voluntary participation and equality, this might promote the establishment of peace in the area. The past years have shown that attempts to settle questions of this kind by force, against the will of the peoples, are absolutely hopeless, and we shall be glad if realisation of this prevails on the Algerian question in France. The Soviet Union did not and does not conceal that its sympathies are with the people fighting against colonialism, for independence and national freedom. It is not hard to see that a peaceful settlement of the Algerian question would enhance the international prestige and role of France as a great power.

#### Settlement of Outstanding Issues—the Way to the Further Improvement of the International Situation

COMRADES Deputies, we have succeeded in achieving a certain improvement in the international climate in general and opening the road to talks on concrete measures to clear the cold war obstacles in the relations between states. We are now entering the stage of such talks.

All this does not mean, of course, that difficulties have been eliminated in international relations or, at least, in the relations between the U.S.S.R. and the United States. The residue of many years cannot, of course, be removed all at once. Such miracles do not happen. Much remains to be done yet to melt the ice of the cold war properly and to achieve a substantial improvement in the relations between states.

But the needle of the international barometer is clearly moving—though not as quickly as we would like—from “stormy” and “rain” to “fine”.

It should not be forgotten that as distinct from the natural change in the seasons of the year, the international weather does not change by itself. To achieve clear and stable weather in the relations between states, systematic, active and peaceful actions are necessary on the part of all governments, and especially the peoples, who should induce their governments to act in the name of peace. The peoples are vitally interested in a relaxation of international tension, in strengthening peace on earth. Therefore, they should know well how the international situation is



shaping in order to urge on their governments, to have them pursue a peaceful policy.

And what does this mean in practice? This means, first of all, that it is necessary to solve, at last, the problem of disarmament, to halt the arms race. If we want to ensure a lasting peace, we can no longer leave the knots in international relations that are a legacy of the Second World War and of the cold war period that followed it. These knots must be unravelled and untied.

Here, it is necessary to bear in mind the need to solve the problem of concluding a peace treaty with Germany, a problem that has long awaited solution. The serious differences on the question of Germany between former allies in the anti-Hitler coalition, and revival of militarism and the revenge-seeking trends in Western Germany, the tension in the relations between the two German states are all making the situation in Europe unstable and fraught with dangerous consequences. All these problems would be largely solved by the conclusion of a peace treaty with the two German states actually in existence, and this in turn would settle the Berlin question.

The Soviet Government's position on the German question has been set forth more than once, and there is no need for me to speak in detail about this. I also explained our position during my conversations with President Eisenhower and, as you will recall, agreement was reached on the desirability of resuming talks on the German question.

One cannot fail to say that in general the situation in Europe is still rather alarming. Big armed forces of both sides are concentrated in the area, and they are in direct contact. Numerous foreign air and naval bases are located in Western Europe and, on top of this, nuclear-rocket bases are being established there; despite world-wide public protests and contrary to the interests of peace, the West German army is being equipped with nuclear and rocket weapons. Therefore the danger of a new military explosion should not be forgotten for a moment.

We have repeatedly advanced proposals for easing the situation in Europe and ensuring the security of all peoples living in the area. We are ready both for far-reaching steps in this direction and for any reasonable partial measures. We only want headway to be made so that the situation in Europe should improve and the European knot should not remain tangled and tied.

The Near East and Middle East continue to remain trouble spots in which the situation is fraught with all manner of complications. True, there is no outright military intervention by imperialist states in the internal affairs of the countries of the area at present, as was the case only recently, but the situation there is still far from normal.

It should be said frankly that the situation is not made better by the fact that the territory of some states is still used by foreign powers—and, partially, to an even greater extent than before—as a springboard in military preparations against third powers.

I have already had occasion to speak of the harm the countries belonging to aggressive blocs can cause to universal peace by making their territory available for the construction of foreign military bases. I should like to return to this question again today.

Indeed, is it possible to speak of any contribution to peace by a state which has made the provision of its national territory for foreign nuclear-rocket bases directed against the Soviet Union all but the basic principle of its policy? Such a country as Turkey, which is our neighbour in the south, belongs to both N.A.T.O. and C.E.N.T.O. It is only S.E.A.T.O. that it has not yet joined—probably because of the distance. But if so-called aid is promised, not even the distance will deter them. True, to promise “aid” is not yet to give it. It seems to me that if a sum were merely promised to the ruling circles of Turkey, they certainly would gladly join S.E.A.T.O. or any other “A.T.O.”

But what is the main result of Turkey's participation in military blocs? Turkish territory has been turned into a veritable *place d'armes* where, on top of everything, foreign rockets with nuclear warheads will now be stationed. There is hardly any need to say that in the first instance this undermines the security of Turkey herself.

We have spoken more than once of the danger of this foreign policy of Turkey and submitted specific proposals for establishing good-neighbourly relations between our states. We sincerely want our relations to be built in the spirit of friendliness and co-operation typical of the fairly recent past when the policy of Turkey was shaped by such an outstanding leader as Kemal Ataturk.

As for our relations with another southern neighbour, Iran, they leave much to be desired. The Soviet Government has in recent years carried out a number of important measures for establishing good and friendly relations with Iran. But the leaders of Iran, contrary to the national interests of their country, preferred to bind themselves by military commitments both within the C.E.N.T.O. military bloc and outside it, commitments directed against the Soviet Union.

Incidentally, about the name of this bloc, which was called the Baghdad Pact in the past. In view of the lessons of the recent past, lessons grievous for the forces of aggression, this bloc is now styled the “Central Treaty Organisation,” C.E.N.T.O., for short. This is very significant. There is a good proverb: “A scalded cat fears cold water.” The Baghdad Pact fell through. And its guiding spirits dare not call it the Ankara or Teheran pact now, but have selected a neutral name, C.E.N.T.O.

Well, we can understand them. They now have greater confidence that the name at any rate will remain.

It must be clearly stated that this policy does not conform to the interests of strengthening peace and improving Soviet-Iranian relations. The direction of Iran's policy must in the future be judged by the concrete deeds of those who shape it.

And yet, both Turkey and Iran have every opportunity for making their contribution to the relaxation of tension in that part of the world and improving the relations with peaceable neighbouring countries.

The attitude of the United States and some other Western Powers to the Chinese People's Republic is a source of grave concern to the world public these days. People's China is a great country which has a population of 650 million and, unquestionably, plays a tremendous part in international life, but the ruling circles of the West would like to turn China into a second-rate power. The West is still seeking to create the impression

that there are two Chinas and not one. Every schoolboy knows, however, that there is only one China and that the capital of the Chinese People's Republic is Peking. No one has ever heard of a China called Taiwan,\* and Taipeh never has been and never will be the capital of China.

Moreover, because of the position of the United States and its allies, the rights of the Chinese People's Republic in the United Nations have still not been restored, although this is against all common sense. China fought against Japan on the side of the allies. It is one of the foundation members of the United Nations and one of the five permanent members of the Security Council. But now its place in the United Nations is occupied by impostors whom the victory of the great revolution in China, the will of the Chinese people, have deprived of the right to represent China. These people have no more right to speak in the name of China and the Chinese people than say, Kerensky, finishing his life in emigration, has the right to speak in the name of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government.

It is known that China's old corrupt regime was overthrown ten years ago by the victory of the People's Revolution and that the Chiang Kai-shek Government was booted out. The Chinese People's Republic was set up. The Government of the Chinese People's Republic enjoys prestige and trust in the country such as no Government ever had throughout the centuries-old history of China. The Soviet Union has the friendliest relations with the Chinese People's Republic and its Government. Now, when the Chinese People's Republic has entered the second decade of its existence, when major political, social and economic transformations have been accomplished there and when outstanding successes have been scored in the development of the economy and culture, the proponents of the senseless "two Chinas" position appear especially ridiculous.

Contrary to obvious facts and the trend of historical development, the United States continues to cling to the remnants of the overthrown Chiang Kai-shek régime. It has helped the Chiang Kai-shekites to entrench themselves on Taiwan and is protecting them by force of arms. Thereby attempts are being made to prevent the completion of the process of revolutionary liberation in the country and the extension to Taiwan and other Chinese territories of the state system that now exists throughout the rest of Chinese territory.

The interference in China's internal affairs, the attempts to "correct" geography and create the artificial situation of "two Chinas" run counter to the people's desire to abolish the cold war, and are creating tension in the Far East.

China was among the questions discussed at the talks I had in the United States. I set forth the Soviet Government's views on both the so-called Taiwan question and the question of China's rights in the United Nations. Shortly afterwards, however, the Secretary of State, Mr. Herter, and his assistant, Mr. Dillon, launched something like a psychological attack against the Soviet Union in their speeches, seeking to twist the nature of the relations between the U.S.S.R. and China, to cast

\* Formosa.

doubt on the sovereignty of the Chinese People's Republic in questions of home and foreign policy.

I don't know how it is said in English, but in Russian such attempts can be called bovine logic. Indeed, who does not know that People's China is a great sovereign state, that its Government pursues an independent home and foreign policy? And the Americans themselves are perfectly right in ridiculing the views expressed by representatives of the State Department. For instance, the well-known American columnist Walter Lippmann rightly emphasised that such statements could only prejudice the cause of improving international co-operation and that it did not behove American statesmen to make official public comments on the relations between the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic. Messrs. Herter and Dillon should know that such manoeuvres cannot produce any results when it comes to the Soviet Union and People's China.

As for the essence of the question, it will be recalled that after the defeat of Japan, Taiwan (Americans prefer to call it Formosa) was restored to China. China's rights to Taiwan have been recorded in the Cairo Declaration, which bears the signature of the late President Roosevelt of the United States, and in the Potsdam Declaration, which bears the signature of former President Truman, as well as in the Act of Surrender of Japan. In its time the United States Government acknowledged that Taiwan was restored to China and that thus the problem was finally solved. In 1950, while Mr. Truman was still President of the United States, he declared that Taiwan was restored to China and that the United States and other allied powers agreed that the Chinese Government should exercise its authority over that island.

Thus, the so-called Taiwan question is one of relations of Chinese with Chinese, a purely internal matter of China. No international complications would have arisen were it not for the interference in China's internal affairs, were it not for the artificial situation created on Taiwan by the military support and protection given to the remnants of the Chiang Kai-shek régime by the United States of America.

We are confident that Taiwan and other islands will be reunited with the rest of China. Any threats or implied threats in this matter are entirely futile. One should bear in mind that not infrequently even a small country cannot be restrained by threats if it seeks to fulfil its national aspirations. The more futile are threats in the case of such a great country as the Chinese People's Republic.

Those who speak of the U.S.S.R.'s responsibility for China's actions should know that the Chinese People's Republic needs no one's tutelage. The People's Government pursues its own policy and represents with dignity its people, the Chinese People's Republic.

If one speaks, however, of the Soviet Union as the ally of the Chinese People's Republic, in that case we are ready to bear this responsibility. The Soviet Union sympathises with and understands the desire of the Chinese people and the Government of the Chinese People's Republic to restore to the Chinese state Taiwan and other islands belonging to China but occupied by foreign troops. On this question we fully support and will continue to support the Government of the Chinese People's

Republic until it ensures a solution of this problem, because legal and moral right is on their side.

Among other Far Eastern problems the question of Korea merits attention. The country is split into two parts. The present situation on the Korean peninsula is such that a military conflict can hardly break out there now. True, the senile Syngman Rhee is still trying to whip up war hysteria. But the Korean Democratic People's Republic takes a calm view of his threats and is confidently building socialism. Both the economic and political situation in the Korean Democratic People's Republic is now good; the country is successfully healing the wounds caused by the war and gaining strength day by day.

Entirely different is the situation in South Korea. The economy, in particular agriculture, is continuing to decline. South Korea is ruined and even Syngman Rhee cannot fail to reckon with the fact that his subjects are not at all eager to start a war against their brothers in North Korea. Furthermore, Syngman Rhee understands, apparently, that if he touches off a war against the Korean Democratic People's Republic it could easily develop into a big war. And he is perfectly aware of the fact that it is not only South Korea that has allies; the K.D.P.R. has them too.

Speaking about the main force which determines the policy of South Korea, our impression is that the United States of America is not seeking an armed conflict there. Now in that corner of the globe, too, the balance of forces is not in favour of those who would like to settle ideological questions by war or any other non-peaceful means.

Favourable conditions are therefore arising to prepare gradually a final settlement of the Korean problem. This should begin with the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea. We are confident that if there were no foreign troops in Korea, if there were no external interference in her affairs, the Koreans themselves would the sooner reach agreement on a gradual *rapprochement* of the North and South, which in turn would create the prerequisites for restoring the national unity of Korea on a peaceful, democratic basis.

The question of the situation in Laos has lately assumed an unsavoury aftertaste. How did this question arise? Circles, well known to everyone, which are more concerned with extending the aggressive S.E.A.T.O. bloc than with strengthening peace in South-East Asia, first secured the suspension of the activities of the International Commission for Laos set up by a decision of the Geneva Conference of 1954. After that the same circles started complicating the situation in Laos itself where, in gross violation of the Geneva agreements, they started persecuting former Pathet Lao forces and even used arms. Although the hostilities in Laos are on the scale of one platoon against another an undue hue and cry was raised all over the world.

As for the Soviet Union, we do not want even the smallest centre of war to exist in Laos, since that would add grist to the mill of aggressive forces. With a reasonable approach and observance of international agreements the skirmishes taking place there could be easily eliminated and the situation normalised. The main point, however, is that the great powers should not interfere in the internal affairs of other states, otherwise undesirable results may be produced.

We regret very much the incidents which occurred recently on the frontier between two states which are our friends—the Chinese People's Republic, with which we are bound by inviolable bonds of fraternal friendship, and the Republic of India, with which our friendly relations are successfully developing. We especially deplore the fact that there were casualties on both sides as a result of these incidents. To the parents and relatives of the victims nothing can make up for the loss. We should be glad if the incidents on the Sino-Indian frontier were not repeated and if the existing disputed frontier questions were settled by friendly negotiation to the mutual satisfaction of both sides.

I believe I need not speak about the Soviet Union's relations with all countries. I mention here only the pivotal questions, the points which to some degree trouble the present international situation. In other countries and points on the globe no particular changes have occurred in recent times.

I can only say that we have every reason to be satisfied with the relations established between us and the majority of countries, especially those with which the Soviet Union's friendly relations are growing and gaining in strength. But we should like to improve relations, to seek complete mutual understanding which would develop into friendship even with those states with whom we have not attained the required degree of mutual understanding as yet.

The relaxation in international tension so far achieved has resulted in an extension of our ties both with the countries of the East and of the West. We must firmly pursue our Leninist peaceloving policy and we shall pursue it with unswerving determination.

#### The Disarmament Problem Must be Solved

COMRADES Deputies, during my visit to the United States, on behalf of the Soviet Government I submitted to the United Nations a proposal for general and complete disarmament.

You are aware of the great positive response this proposal of the Soviet Union evoked in all countries of the world.

We Soviet people consider that the disarmament problem is the most important problem of our time. Whither mankind will go—towards peace or towards war—depends on our ability to find a solution of that problem. It seems that in our days there are no two different opinions on this score.

Never before in the history of mankind have the peoples had to give such a great share of their labour to the manufacture of means of destruction as they do now. The arms race has become all-embracing. The armies are growing, the so-called conventional armaments are increasing and improving, the stock-piles of nuclear bombs and rocket weapons are continually mounting. The *New York Herald Tribune* has reported that from July, 1945, to the end of last year there were staged about 250 nuclear explosions, the aggregate power of which amounts to approximately 100 million tons of trinitrotoluene. The power of these explosions is many times greater than that of all the bombs, mortar and artillery shells exploded during the First and Second World Wars combined. But one should consider that the prototype samples of nuclear bombs exploded thus far represent a very small share of atomic and

hydrogen weapon stockpiles. This is the pass to which mankind has been brought by the arms race!

Only recently great distances, such as oceans, formed a natural barrier to the spreading of wars from one continent to another. The First and Second World Wars mainly devastated Europe. Some states still could play safe beyond the expanses of ocean or in remote areas. They were able not only to avoid destruction and other disasters of war but even made tremendous profits out of war.

The situation is different now. The most terrible weapon of destruction, the nuclear weapon, can be delivered to any point on the globe in a matter of minutes. A new war would spare no one and would inflict untold loss of life, destruction and suffering on mankind. There would be no difference between the front and the rear, between soldiers and peaceful civilians.

To bar the road to war it is necessary to effect general and complete disarmament. It is to this end that the Soviet Government submitted to the United Nations the proposals you all know about.

What is the substance of the Soviet programme? We propose to effect general and complete disarmament of states over a very short period, approximately four years. This means that all armed forces would be disbanded, all armaments destroyed, all military production stopped. The nuclear, chemical, bacteriological and rocket weapons would be banned and destroyed once and for all. The War Ministries and general staffs would be abolished, the military bases on foreign territories would be closed down, no one would undergo military training any more. Spendings for military purposes in any form would cease.

The states would only have small contingents of police or militia of agreed size, to be used for the maintenance of internal order and the security of the citizens, and armed only with small arms.

We propose the establishment of rigorous, effective and all-embracing international control so that no one could violate the agreement on general disarmament.

General and complete disarmament would mark the beginning of a new stage in the development of human society, a world without wars.

General and complete disarmament would also mean a tremendous improvement in the wellbeing of all peoples. The scrapping of military expenditures would release tremendous material resources for the expansion of the peaceful branches of the economy in all countries, big and small. Considerable means could be devoted to advancing the economy and raising the living standards of the population of the economically backward countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Many factories, power stations, irrigation systems, homes, schools and hospitals could be built there. The scientists of all countries would receive tremendous additional possibilities to work for peace, for the benefit of the peoples, for extending scientific research in most diverse spheres—in technology, in medicine, in space exploration, etc. They could pool their efforts for the realisation of many majestic scientific programmes.

If an attempt were now made to sum up, if only in a preliminary way, the world public's response to the Soviet disarmament proposals, it could be said that our proposals have stirred up the broadest sections of the

population in all countries of the world. The Soviet Government's disarmament proposals have been approved by the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of China and have won unanimous support in all socialist countries.

The problem of disarmament is now not merely an object of talks between diplomats and of study by experts. It is a major issue of people's struggle in which the vast majority of mankind takes part.

During my visit to America I discussed the problem of disarmament with President Eisenhower. I am pleased to note that Mr. Eisenhower spoke of the need to seek a solution of the disarmament problem. We consider that the reaction to the Soviet proposals by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Macmillan, the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, the President of Indonesia, Dr. Sukarno, and others has a positive importance for the coming talks. It is gratifying to note that a majority of delegates at the current session of the United Nations General Assembly demonstrated, in one way or another, their positive attitude to the idea of general and complete disarmament.

Great interest is shown in our disarmament proposals by the public and political and business circles of different countries. We welcome, in particular, the statement by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Geoffrey Fisher, and thank him for his correct understanding and support of the Soviet proposals for general and complete disarmament. It is especially valuable that this was made by an Archbishop, the head of the Anglican Church, who recognised the humanism of our proposals from Christian positions. It is to be expected that he will be followed by other believers, by clergymen of other religions, if they are really guided by what their religious teaching says about peace among peoples, about the impermissibility of wars between nations.

Naturally, the favourable reception given to our proposals by broad public circles does not mean that there are no big obstacles on the road to the coming disarmament talks and that there won't be any. We are realists and we are well aware that far from everyone is happy about our proposals for general and complete disarmament. There are still champions of the arms race and the cold war in the world today, there are still influential capitalist monopolies which coin huge profits from the arms race. They will have no scruples about using any means in an attempt to prevent general and complete disarmament and they are already at work. True, the world public's affirmative reaction to the Soviet proposals does not permit them to speak out openly against these proposals. They act in a roundabout way, twisting the substance of these proposals and spreading deliberate lies about them.

Some people in the West are trying to cast a doubt on the sincerity of our proposals. But we are already familiar with such spurious tactics.

The Soviet Government always has been a champion of disarmament. From the very inception of the Soviet state we have stood on positions of struggle against militarism, for disarmament. In the very first days of the October Revolution V. I. Lenin called for an end to war. The Soviet Government disbanded the army and we adopted the system of militia. But when we were attacked, we were obliged to establish an army to defend the country. These measures, by the way, were forced

on us by no one else but Germany, Britain, France, the United States and Japan, because they sent troops to our country and rendered military and material aid to the enemies of the revolution. The Soviet people were compelled to arm to defend their revolutionary gains and the country's independence.

Later, when the League of Nations was set up, the Soviet Government submitted comprehensive proposals for disarmament and the destruction of weapons. These proposals were set out by the Soviet representative, Litvinov.

Now we have put forward proposals for general and complete disarmament on a new basis, taking account of the new situation and the new balance of forces obtaining in the world today.

In the past, some people rejected our proposals, saying that only the Soviet Union stood to gain by them, because it was weak at the time. True, the Soviet Union was then the only socialist country and, unquestionably, immeasurably weaker than today. But even then, in submitting our disarmament proposals, we guided ourselves by the humane ideas of preserving peace on earth.

Today the balance of forces is entirely different. In the Second World War, we and our allies routed a powerful enemy. After the war the Soviet people successfully rehabilitated their national economy and achieved an unheard of advancement in the economy and culture, science and technology, and a rise in the wellbeing of the broad masses of the working people. The Soviet Union is universally recognised as a mighty world power. Today the Soviet Union is no longer alone. There exists a great camp of socialist states. No one can say in these conditions that our proposals for general and complete disarmament are dictated by weakness. We have everything necessary for defending our country against any encroachment from without and giving a shattering rebuff to an enemy. We can not only ensure non-interference in our affairs but also help the fraternal socialist countries to protect their gains, their freedom and independence.

Therefore, when we submit disarmament proposals today, it is perfectly clear that they really are dictated by humane ideals and are designed to preclude war, which can inflict terrible suffering in this age of thermo-nuclear weapons. We do not want to use for military ends the advantages we have and which will increase with the further development of the socialist countries.

Our whole policy, founded on the Marxist-Leninist theory, is permeated with concern for man, for the happiness of the peoples. For this reason we are against war.

There are leaders in the West who are loath to abandon the old views and assert that one must have force and, from positions of force, dictate one's will to the weak. They are trying, on the sly, to sap the people's faith in the reality of the Soviet proposals for control even though it is clearly stated in both my speech at the United Nations General Assembly and in the declaration of the Soviet Government that, given general disarmament, we are ready to have general control.

A careful study of our proposals will show that the Soviet Government proposes the establishment of strict international control over all

disarmament measures. For every stage of disarmament we propose an appropriate stage of control. We also propose that controllers should be present on the territory of states from the very start of the disarmament process and until its full completion, and also after disarmament, so that no state could secretly prepare for war. We want the volume of control to correspond to the nature of the disarmament measures.

We are also agreeable to the establishment of appropriate agencies, apparently under the aegis of the United Nations, to ensure effective control over the strict observance of the sacred disarmament commitments assumed by the states.

In his speech during the celebrations of United Nations Week, Mr. Harriman was sceptical about the Soviet Government's proposals. Our proposals seem to have made a strong impression on him. Apparently, he does not accept them in his heart and, for this reason, has taken upon himself the preposterous part of a worm trying to undermine confidence in the Soviet proposals.

Hardly did discussion of the disarmament question begin than sceptics pushed to the forefront the question of what international forces should be set up to replace the national forces. Reading between the lines, one will arrive at the conclusion that what is meant, perhaps, is the establishment of international forces that will be under the influence of the countries which today, because of the policy of blocs, have a majority in the United Nations. This very much resembles the policy of knocking together military blocs such as N.A.T.O., S.E.A.T.O. and C.E.N.T.O. This policy in no way conforms to the interests of disarmament. We are for disarmament, but for honest disarmament.

If all countries are disarmed and will have no weapons or armies, no one will be able to start a war. The question arises: Why should one then have supra-national armed forces?

We believe that if complete and general disarmament is effected, it will be possible to find forces of moral influence, to take various measures and sanctions by decision of the United Nations with regard to one country or another which might risk starting a conflict.

Those who advocate the formation of international armed forces have only one purpose—to hold back countries from accepting our disarmament proposals. Paying lip-service to the idea of disarmament, they in fact want to preserve the old state of affairs, that is to say, to live on a powder barrel, to live in fear of the use of nuclear weapons.

It must be hoped that common sense will prevail. Sooner or later reasonable decisions will be taken which will enable the peoples to live in friendship, to trust one another and not to interfere in the affairs of other states.

The enemies of peace resort to another stratagem in order to discredit the Soviet disarmament programme. They allege that the position of the U.S.S.R. on disarmament is that we advance the principle, "All or nothing": that is to say, that we propose general and complete disarmament and do not agree to anything else. This does not correspond to the facts.

Our proposals state in black and white that if the Western Powers are not willing to accept general and complete disarmament, we regard it as

possible and necessary to come to terms if only on partial steps towards disarmament. The Soviet Union believes that such measures include a ban on nuclear weapons and—above all—the ending of tests of such weapons; the setting up of zones of control and inspection with a reduction of foreign troops on the territories of appropriate countries in Europe; the creation of an atom-free zone in Central Europe; the closing down of foreign military bases on alien soil; the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the N.A.T.O. member-states and the countries party to the Warsaw Treaty, and so on.

The Soviet Government, of course, is prepared to examine and discuss amendments and addenda to our proposals as well as any other proposals designed to solve the disarmament problem. However, it must be emphasised that the problem of disarmament has become particularly important and acute today and at the same time an urgent matter. The welfare and security of the peoples, the question of war or peace, depend on its solution.

It is pleasant to note that the Political Committee of the United Nations, thanks to the understanding reached between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, approved the proposals on the question of general and complete disarmament. The draft joint Soviet-American resolution on this question was warmly supported by the representatives of Britain, France and other countries. As you know, it was announced officially that the other 80 delegations of the United Nations member-states had subscribed to this joint draft as co-sponsors.

We warmly welcome this unanimous decision. However, we must not entertain delusions concerning what has been achieved, for there are still forces that will do everything in order to prevent realistic measures on general and complete disarmament.

There are worms that do not destroy a tree directly because they cannot do it, but they gnaw at and destroy its bark, depriving the tree of nutrition. And the tree rots at the roots. That is how some politicians will seek to gnaw at our proposals for general and complete disarmament.

It is necessary to expose the opponents of disarmament, to give them a vigorous rebuff in order to realise the bright hopes of the peoples.

Comrades Deputies, it is now clear that the problems facing the world can be solved only if one proceeds from positions of reason and not from positions of strength. These problems must be solved by the only reasonable method—the method of negotiation. I should like to emphasise the great importance of the mutual understanding reached with President Eisenhower of the United States that all unsettled international problems must be solved by peaceful means, through negotiation, and not by the use of force.

If one speaks of the method of negotiation, the convening of a heads of government conference is of paramount importance. We discussed with President Eisenhower the question of convening a heads of government conference, or, as it is called, a Summit Meeting, and I must say we reached mutual understanding on this question. It is common knowledge that President Eisenhower declared after our conversations that the exchange of opinion eliminated many of the earlier objections to the meeting. Mr. Macmillan, the Prime Minister of Britain, in his turn, has

declared more than once that he is in favour of a conference of the heads of government.

The Soviet Government is fully in accord with the view that it is desirable to call such a meeting as soon as possible. We hope that the governments of other powers will also assume a constructive approach to this question.

Certain western statesmen now express the opinion that a heads of government conference should be held when the principal disputed problems have first been solved, and claim that only in this case will a summit conference be effective. But this can be said only by those who do not reckon with the actual state of affairs, or those who wish to mislead people little versed in politics. If the basic questions were solved before the summit meeting, this would not be a conference for solving urgent problems, but a get-together for angling (and I am not an angler and don't go in for fishing), concert-going, etc.—that is say, for a pleasant pastime.

We must look life squarely in the face and understand realistically what is needed precisely from the summit conference. What we need today is the settlement of pressing problems.

It is common knowledge that the Geneva Foreign Ministers' Conference and other international meetings have already considered some of them, but without finding a solution. Moreover, in some cases the situation was even strained.

What, then, is to be done? We have already said more than once that the most complicated international problems can be solved only by the heads of government, who are vested with great powers.

Only they are able to clear up the accretions and abnormalities piled up in international relations during the long years of the cold war. It is precisely today that we are living through a period when a summit meeting is necessary. The sooner this meeting is held the better it will be for the cause of peace.

What questions, to my mind, should be discussed at a summit meeting?

Obviously these must be the very questions, the unresolved problems, which arouse the greatest alarm in the world and prevent the further easing of international tension. The question of disarmament, which agitates the entire world, should, of course, occupy the most important place. We believe that in the interests of strengthening peace the conference should consider the question of concluding a peace treaty with Germany and the consequent normalisation of the situation in West Berlin. The conference could also discuss other international questions of common interest.

The success of a summit meeting would be promoted by a firm resolution by all states not to take any steps liable to worsen the situation before the meeting, liable to increase mistrust in relations between its parties or sow seeds of suspicion.

As for the Soviet Union, it will promote in every way the further improvement of the situation before the summit meeting.

\* \* \*

Comrades Deputies, the Soviet Government believes it is its duty to the people and all mankind to strengthen the relaxation in tension



achieved in international relations, to steer a course leading from relaxation to the complete elimination of international tension, to turn the relaxation that has been achieved into a lasting peace.

For these purposes it is necessary:

To pursue an active policy of improving relations among states;

To work, step by step, for the solution in practice of all the urgent international questions so as to ensure for the peoples a peaceful life;

Not to relax vigilance with regard to the forces and circles trying to turn the march of international events back to the road of cold war and the aggravation of international relations; to show the people constantly the bankruptcy, harm, and deadly nature to mankind of this bellicose position of the militarist circles.

If all the forces coming out for the peaceful settlement of international relations are brought into play, if the leading circles shaping western policy realise the impossibility of pursuing any policy in our time other than the policy of peaceful co-existence, if the peoples raise their weighty voice against war, then decisive steps will be taken shortly to eliminate the war danger and a bright, radiant road to peace will be opened up to mankind.

The Soviet Government, on its part, will do its utmost for the accomplishment of this great task.

Permit me to express confidence that the session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. will approve the foreign policy of the Soviet Government.

Comrades Deputies, the further struggle for the consolidation of peace, for strengthening the foundations of peaceful co-existence between states with differing political systems, calls for big efforts by the Soviet Union, the countries of the socialist camp, and all peaceloving peoples.

The consistent peaceloving policy of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries is meeting with increasing support from the peace forces of the world. The stronger and more united the great family of nations, the more successful and rapid will be the accomplishment of the task of strengthening world peace. It is with profound satisfaction that we can declare that all countries of the world system of socialism are united as never before. They are coming out in unity for the accomplishment of their historic task of ridding mankind of war and safeguarding the advance of the peoples along the road of peace and social progress.

The Soviet people, jointly with all people of the socialist countries, recently celebrated the glorious tenth anniversaries of the Chinese People's Republic and the German Democratic Republic, the fifteenth anniversaries of the establishment of people's government in Poland, Rumania and Bulgaria. A new life is being built successfully in all socialist countries.

Permit me, Comrades, to convey on your behalf, on behalf of the Soviet people, warm greetings to our brothers in the people's democracies and to wish them fresh successes in building socialism.

The Soviet Union is confidently advancing, successfully carrying out the tasks of building communism, set by the Twenty-First Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Our Soviet homeland is making great progress. The programme of the first year of the Seven-Year

Plan is being successfully fulfilled and overfulfilled. The current session of the Supreme Soviet has examined the national economic plan and the State Budget for 1960, the second year of the Seven-Year Plan.

The first year of the Seven-Year Plan has been marked by fresh big achievements in the advance of industry, farming, culture and science and a rise in the living standards of the people. As you know, the state plan for the nine months has been considerably overfulfilled by industry. According to preliminary estimates, the annual plan will be overfulfilled by industry by approximately 4 per cent, which will yield over 40,000 million roubles' worth of output over and above the plan. Socialist agriculture is also on the upgrade. The forthcoming plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will discuss questions relating to the further development of this important branch of the national economy.

The unprecedented growth of political and labour activity, of creative enthusiasm, of the communist consciousness of the Soviet people and their monolithic cohesion behind the Communist Party are the principal, the most remarkable and most joyous of all our achievements. Therein we see the mainspring of all our success, a guarantee of the complete victory of communism.

Each day brings us joyous tidings of more and more victories of the Soviet people. How can we fail to rejoice, to take pride in such exploits of the Soviet people as the successful launching—in one year, 1959, alone—of three space rockets, which aroused the admiration of all mankind. The entire Soviet people are glorifying the men of science and labour who have blazed the trail into outer space.

These days our remarkable scientists have presented one more splendid gift to their homeland. They properly paid court to the Moon and she responded favourably, permitting them to photograph the side which she had always kept a mystery.

We rightly take pride in the Soviet scientists who persuaded the Moon to remove her veil—that vestige of the past. Under the influence of the advance of Soviet science and culture, the Moon discarded her veil, began to march in step with our time and disclosed her face to the Soviet scientists, to all the Soviet people. And they enabled the whole world to get acquainted with the cherished mysteries of this celestial beauty. Of course, with her permission. We are no peeping Toms.

Permit me from this high forum, on behalf of the Soviet Government, on behalf of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., on behalf of the Central Committee of our Communist Party, to congratulate warmly the heroic scientists on this glorious scientific exploit.

Permit me to wish them fresh success, discoveries and just as splendid achievements to the glory of our great country in which communism is proving victorious, for the sake of the triumph of peace on earth.

Dear Comrades, the Third Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. has been convened on the eve of the forty-second anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The Soviet people under the glorious banner of the October Revolution are firmly advancing along the road indicated by the great Lenin, advancing towards the complete victory of communism.



## *Appeal by U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet to Parliaments of all Countries*

THE SUPREME SOVIET of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics appeals to the parliaments of all countries of the world on a matter of vital importance to mankind.

The development of international relations has entered upon a crucial stage. The century of the atom, electronics and the conquest of outer space has opened up vast and magnificent prospects for the advance of science and technology. Yet at the same time mankind is faced with a real threat of these great discoveries being used for the purpose of exterminating human beings and destroying material values.

Enormous stocks of means of annihilation possessing gigantic destructive force have already been accumulated. And yet the arms drive is increasing, drawing new countries into its monstrous orbit and sucking blood from the peoples. Truly fantastic sums are being wasted on the production of deadly weapons while millions of people and many nations are still living in poverty and are deprived of living conditions worthy of man. The arms drive and the cold war are spoiling the relations between the states, raising artificial barriers which hamper relations between peoples and trade between countries and hinder their economic progress.

The arms drive is driving mankind into the abyss of another war. When the spirit of mistrust and animosity prevails in relations between states, when armies many millions strong oppose one another and bombers carrying deadly loads of nuclear weapons cross the sky, the slightest false step may lead to catastrophe.

Within a few minutes a war would then break out in which there would be no difference between the rear and the front, between soldiers and civilians. The destruction of thousands of towns and villages, factories and mills, hundreds of millions of ruined lives, the loss of monuments of culture which are beyond price—that will be the inevitable result if the peoples, parliaments and governments are not able to prevent such developments.

What is the way out? How can an end be put to the existing situation and how can a calm and peaceful life be ensured for the peoples?

There is one decisive and reliable means of precluding the possibility of war being unleashed, namely, the general and complete disarmament of states. When the means of warfare are destroyed, all weapons abolished and armies disbanded, then and in that way the conditions will be created for an enduring peace on earth, for a world without wars and bloodshed.

General and complete disarmament will place all states in an equal position. It will not be prejudicial to any country but, on the contrary, will ensure security for all peoples. Any doubts to the effect that measures in the sphere of the reduction of armaments may benefit one state to the detriment of others—doubts which have been aroused when it has been a question of only partial disarmament—will fall to the

ground. No difficulties of control will any longer stand in the way of disarmament. If disarmament is total and universal, control, too, will be comprehensive and complete.

General and complete disarmament will indeed open up a new era in the history of international relations. The peaceful co-existence of states with different social and economic systems will be placed on a firm foundation. All states will live as good neighbours. New opportunities will open up for the development of economic, cultural and trade relations between countries and peoples. Many international problems seem insoluble today. But once the arms race has been stopped and the armies have been disbanded, new opportunities and ways for settling those problems will immediately appear.

Vast material and financial resources which are now being expended on armaments will be released. How many houses, schools, hospitals, factories, power stations, dams and roads could be built with these resources! Taxes which now swallow up a steadily increasing part of the incomes of workers and peasants will be drastically reduced. Inexhaustible opportunities will appear for carrying out vast scientific and technical projects, and scientists and specialists will have the opportunity of serving only peace and prosperity.

General and complete disarmament will open a new page in the history of the development of economically underdeveloped countries. The economic development of these countries is now proceeding rather slowly. Millions of people in Asia, Africa and Latin America are still starving or are on the brink of starvation. By releasing vast material and financial reserves, disarmament will help towards the elimination of this inequality and will speed up the process of ending the age-old backwardness of underdeveloped and colonial countries by providing a new source of funds for assisting them economically.

Is it possible to achieve general and complete disarmament at the present stage? Isn't that utopian?

No, at the present time it is not utopian. The U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet expresses firm confidence that this goal can be achieved. Whereas a few decades ago sufficient strength and means were lacking for carrying out the idea of general and complete disarmament, now this idea has become the banner of vast masses of people, of whole peoples and nations. Now, there is a large group of states consistently fighting for its realisation.

The solution of the disarmament problem is in the hands of man. Man created destructive weapons. He can and must destroy them!

The prospects for solving this most pressing problem of our time are all the more favourable because changes for the better have recently been brought about in international developments. Ever broader sections of the population, members of parliament and statesmen are becoming aware of the senselessness and danger of a further arms race. Everywhere the desire is growing to put an end to the cold war and to solve disputed international problems without the use of force, on the basis of negotiations and agreements.

An outstanding contribution to the easing of international tension

was made by the visit to the United States of Nikita Khrushchov, the Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, and his meetings with Mr. Dwight D. Eisenhower, the President of the United States.

Before mankind there is opening up a realistic possibility of directing international developments along a new road, of putting an end to the arms race, of making the method of negotiation the only method of solving international problems.

Now everything depends on the will and persistence of the peoples.

A special responsibility rests with the parliaments, governments and statesmen. The peoples, the electorate expect the parliaments to have their say. It is precisely the parliaments and governments that must persistently and resolutely search for ways of solving international problems that are in dispute, and above all, the most pressing of our time—the problem of disarmament.

There are no political, economic, or other reasons that would justify a continued arms race. The only circles that are resisting disarmament are those which place their selfish interests above everything else and are hostile to the aspirations and desires of the peoples. But the resistance of those circles can be overcome. The vital interests of mankind insistently demand that this resistance should be broken.

There are realistic ways of solving the problem of general and complete disarmament. These are set forth in the Soviet Government's proposals which have been submitted to the United Nations for consideration. Now it depends directly on the governments and parliaments of other countries, and above all the biggest powers, on their good will and their desire, whether the manufacture of instruments of death and destruction is ended and the stock-piles of armaments are destroyed, whether mankind goes along the road to a fatal war or takes to the road of peaceful development.

As far as the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet and the Government of the Soviet Union are concerned, in accordance with the will of the Soviet people, they will do their utmost to settle the disarmament problem and to turn into a lasting peace the relaxation of international tension which has been achieved.

Fully approving the peaceful initiative of the Soviet Government, which has submitted to the United Nations a programme for general and complete disarmament, the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet expresses its confidence that this noble initiative of the Soviet Government will meet with understanding and support from the parliaments and governments of other countries.

The U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet is hopeful that the parliaments and members of parliament of all countries will, for their part, do everything possible to relieve the peoples of a terrible scourge—the arms race—and to achieve disarmament and open up before mankind the road to eternal peace on Earth.

THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE UNION OF  
SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS.

*Kremlin, Moscow. October 31st, 1959.*

## OTHER BOOKLETS ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND PEACE

- No. 29 **Efforts of the Soviet Union Towards Summit Talks.**  
Documents January-May 1958. 2s.
- No. 31 **New Steps for Peace by Socialist Countries.**  
May 24, 1958. 4d.
- No. 34 **Efforts of the Soviet Union for Summit Talks and Peace.**  
Documents April 22-July 2, 1958. 2s.
- No. 32 **If the Arms Race Were Stopped.** Professor M. Rubinstein  
3d.
- No. 35 **The Middle East: Soviet Statements.** January-August  
1958. 4d.
- No. 38 **Soviet People Say "NO" to Atom War.** 6d.
- No. 39 **Soviet Proposals on Disarmament at the 13th Session  
of U.N.O.** September 1958. 3d.
- No. 41 **The Situation in the Taiwan Area (Formosa).** 3d.
- S.W.B. **Nikita Khrushchov: World Peace is the Desire of All  
Peoples.** 4d.
- No. 53 **Soviet Efforts for the Solution of the Questions of  
Germany and West Berlin:** March-August 1959. 1s.
- No. 56 **Nations Should Live as Good Neighbours.** N. S.  
Khrushchov's American TV Speech. 3d.

**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 BOOKLETS—Annual subscription 5s. (post free).

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

*For regular news on the U.S.S.R. read*

# **SOVIET WEEKLY**

**Illustrated**

**Thursday 3d.**



Authentic, well-written articles on Soviet scientific achievements, on industry, agriculture, sport, international relations, and other aspects of Soviet life and work, can be found within its well-illustrated pages.



**Subscription rates: 3s. 3d., 3 months; 6s. 6d., 6 months;  
13s. 0d., 12 months.**

from newsagents, or post free from

**"SOVIET WEEKLY",  
3 ROSARY GARDENS, LONDON, S.W.7**