



SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY  
BASIC ACTS AND DOCUMENTS  
OF THE SUPREME SOVIET  
OF THE U.S.S.R.  
1956-1962

746

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

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

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





SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY  
BASIC ACTS AND DOCUMENTS  
OF THE SUPREME SOVIET  
OF THE U.S.S.R.  
1956-1962

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PUBLISHING HOUSE  
Moscow 1962

СБОРНИК  
ОСНОВНЫХ АКТОВ И ДОКУМЕНТОВ  
ВЕРХОВНОГО СОВЕТА СССР  
ПО ВНЕШНЕПОЛИТИЧЕСКИМ ВОПРОСАМ  
1956—1962

COMPILED BY:  
K. U. CHERNENKO (CHIEF EDITOR), F. I. KALINYCHEV,  
V. S. SEMYONOV, V. G. VYSOTIN, V. V. YEUGENYEV

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Introduction . . . . .	7
DECREE ON PEACE	
Adopted by the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets on October 26 (November 8), 1917 . . . . .	17
SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY	
Principal Acts and Documents of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. 1956-1962 (In Chronological Order)	
Appeal for Disarmament Addressed by the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. to the Parliaments of All Countries of the World (July 16, 1956) . . . . .	25
Statement by the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. in Connection with an Appeal from the Japanese Diet in the Matter of a Ban on Nuclear Weapons and Discontinuation of Their Test- ing (July 16, 1956) . . . . .	27
Statement Tabled by a Group of Deputies to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. in the Matter of the Cessation of Nuclear Weapons Tests (May 9, 1957) . . . . .	29
Statement by A. A. Gromyko, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., in Reply to a Question to the Soviet Government, Tabled by a Group of Deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., on the Cessation of Nuclear Weapons Tests (May 10, 1957) . . . . .	31
Resolution of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. (May 10, 1957) . . . . .	37

Message by the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. to the U.S. Congress and the British Parliament ( <i>May 10, 1957</i> ) . . . . .	38
Message of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to All Working People, Political and Public Leaders, Workers in Science and Culture, Parliaments and Governments of All Countries ( <i>November 6, 1957</i> ) . . . . .	41
Resolution of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. on the Foreign Policy of the Soviet Government ( <i>December 21, 1957</i> ) . . . . .	45
Resolution of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. on the Unilateral Discontinuation of Atomic and Thermonuclear Weapons Tests by the Soviet Union ( <i>March 31, 1958</i> ) . . . . .	49
Address of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. to the Congress of the U.S.A. on Ending Nuclear Weapons Tests ( <i>March 31, 1958</i> ) . . . . .	52
Address of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. to the Parliament of Great Britain on Ending Nuclear Weapons Tests ( <i>March 31, 1958</i> ) . . . . .	55
Address of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. to the Bundestag of the Federal Republic of Germany ( <i>March 31, 1958</i> ) . . . . .	58
Address of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. to the Parliaments of All Countries of the World on Ending Nuclear Weapons Tests ( <i>March 31, 1958</i> ) . . . . .	63
Resolution of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. Commissioning the Chairmen of the Chambers to Address a Message to the Parliaments of Member States of the Anti-Hitler Coalition and the Countries Which Suffered from Nazi Aggression During the Second World War ( <i>March 31, 1958</i> ) . . . . .	66
Resolution of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. on the Cessation of Atomic and Thermonuclear Weapons Tests and on the Berlin Question ( <i>December 25, 1958</i> ) . . . . .	67
Report by Deputy N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., First Secretary of the C.C. C.P.S.U., "On International Situation and the Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union" ( <i>October 31, 1959</i> ) . . . . .	71
Resolution of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. on the Report Made by N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., on the International Situation and the Foreign Policy of the U.S.S.R. ( <i>October 31, 1959</i> ) . . . . .	105

Message of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the Parliaments of All Countries of the World ( <i>October 31, 1959</i> ) . . . . .	106
Report by Deputy N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., First Secretary of the C.C. C.P.S.U., "Disarmament for Durable Peace and Friendship" ( <i>January 14, 1960</i> ) . . . . .	111
Law on a Further Considerable Reduction of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. ( <i>January 15, 1960</i> ) . . . . .	166
Message of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the Parliaments and Governments of All the States in the World ( <i>January 15, 1960</i> ) . . . . .	169
Report by Deputy A. A. Gromyko, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., "On the Geneva Negotiations" ( <i>April 24, 1962</i> ) . . . . .	174
Resolution of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. on the Report Made on April 25, 1962, by Deputy A. A. Gromyko, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. . . . .	200

## INTRODUCTION

Peace and socialism are inseparable. The first legislative act of the world's first socialist state was the historic Decree on Peace, written by Lenin, the founder and head of the socialist state, and adopted by the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets on October 26 (November 8), 1917.

This first act of legislation (which see in this collection) contained the basic features of the Soviet state's peaceful foreign policy. Although the young Soviet Republic was still weak it had full confidence in the historical justice of its cause, it declared predatory war to be a most heinous crime against humanity and proposed peace and co-operation to all states.

In this way the foundation of a foreign policy unprecedented in history was laid, the policy of the working class, of all those who labour and are vitally interested in the establishment of peace and friendship between nations.

Throughout its history the Soviet state has been constantly guided by Lenin's principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and has always consistently pursued a policy of peace, friendship and the development of mutually beneficial economic and cultural relations with all countries. The Soviet state spares no effort to uphold and preserve peace throughout the world.

The policy of the Soviet state is an expression of the vital interests of the many millions of Soviet people who have been educated on the noble ideas of peace and humanism.

The Soviet people, who won their freedom and independence in a hard-fought and stubborn struggle, are firmly convinced of the actual possibility of preventing war, the possibility of alienating war from human society. "We are for peace," said Soviet Prime Minister Khrushchov, "and we are for communism. A war between states is not necessary for the victory of communism.... We stand for the strict observation of the principle of non-intervention in the affairs of other countries." Such is the watchword of our state and of our people; it is perfectly clear and expresses

the will of the Soviet people and the hopes and aspirations of millions of other people who are taking part in the struggle to preserve peace on earth and counteract the threat of a fresh world war.

It is also obvious to the Soviet people that there must be an active struggle for peace and for the triumph of reason. This sacred struggle, in the vanguard of which are the peoples of the great socialist commonwealth, is day by day spreading and growing in all continents, ever new freedom-loving forces are entering the battle.

Parliaments can and do play a tremendous role in the struggle for peace. The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., the highest organ of state power in our country, is a truly popular parliament that always acts in the interests of the Soviet people. It regularly pursues an active peace policy and in the sphere of foreign policy proceeds from the proposition that parliaments bear a tremendous responsibility for the fate of the peace.

This collection offers the reader a selection of the chief foreign policy acts and documents of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. from 1956 to 1962.

The Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union held in February 1956 stressed the fact that in the present international situation there exist real possibilities of preventing aggressive imperialist forces from plunging the nations into a new war. The Congress declared that wars are not fatally inevitable and put forward a broad and realistic programme of action to guarantee the preservation and consolidation of peace. The substance of this programme, an expression of the will of the many millions of Soviet people, is the deliverance of mankind from the dangerous and burdensome arms race, the elimination of the remnants of the Second World War and the removal of obstacles to normalising the world situation.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, relying on the wide support of the peace-loving forces throughout the world, firmly and consistently pursue the Leninist policy of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and expose and resolutely check the provocations of imperialist warmongers.

This serves as a reliable guarantee of the preservation of peace and prevents the dark forces of reaction from turning

the competition between the two systems from the path of peace to that of armed conflicts, to the path of war.

The correctness of the foreign policy course evolved at the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. has been fully confirmed in practice; it was given further constructive development in the decisions of the Extraordinary Twenty First Congress and especially in the documents of the Twenty Second Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union that was held in October 1961.

The Twenty Second Congress once again proclaimed, in the name of the lofty ideals of social progress and human happiness, that the general line in Soviet foreign policy has been and remains the unswerving and consistent realisation of the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence.

The decisions of the Congress, permeated with the ideas of genuine humanism, the ideas of peace and brotherhood between all peoples, have become a banner in the struggle of the peoples against the preparation of a new, destructive war by the forces of imperialism.

*"In adopting its new Programme,"* said Khrushchov in his report to the Congress, *"our great Party solemnly proclaims to the whole of mankind that it sees as the principal aim of its foreign policy not only the prevention of world war but also its expulsion for all time from the life of society, already within the lifetime of our generation."*

That parliaments bear a tremendous responsibility for the fate of the peace may be judged from the one fact alone that they, as representative bodies, adopt legislation on questions of war and peace, discuss and approve the country's budget in which allocations are made for armaments and for the maintenance of the army. They are bound to take into consideration the will of those who elected them and the irresistible urge for peace among large sections of the people.

On many occasions the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. has appealed to the parliaments of other states to take account of the great responsibility they bear for the fate of the peace and to take definite and effective steps towards the earliest possible solution of all world problems by peaceful means, towards eliminating the "cold war" and ensuring the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

In this respect the Appeal of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. for Disarmament, addressed to the parliaments of all countries on July 16, 1956, was of great significance as an act expressing the attitude of the highest organ of state power in the U.S.S.R. to urgent international problems. The Supreme Soviet, guided by the lofty purpose of strengthening peace between the peoples, deemed it its duty to draw the attention of all peoples, and the governments and parliaments of all states to the most urgent and important problem of the day, the problem that troubles all the peoples of the world—that of calling a halt to the arms race, reducing armaments and prohibiting atomic and hydrogen weapons.

The Supreme Soviet approved the decision of the Soviet Government to reduce the armed forces and armaments, regarding it as an act of goodwill, as an unusually important undertaking that facilitated the practical solution of the disarmament problem; it called upon the parliaments of all states to study the initiative of the Soviet Union, to support it and, in their turn, adopt effective measures to check the arms race, reduce the armed forces and armaments and thus make a worthy contribution to the consolidation of peace between the peoples.

Sincere concern for the preservation of peace and a desire to deliver mankind from the danger of war permeate all subsequent acts of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. in the sphere of foreign policy.

On the eve of the fortieth anniversary of the Soviet state, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. proclaimed at its Jubilee Session on November 6, 1957, that peace is in the hands of the peoples themselves, and addressed a Message to all working people, to men and women active in the political and social spheres, to representatives of science and culture, to the parliaments and governments of all countries, to take resolute action to prevent a new war.

The decision of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., adopted on March 31, 1958, to cease the testing of all types of atomic and hydrogen weapons in the U.S.S.R., met with the approval of progressive forces throughout the world. The Supreme Soviet expressed the hope that the parliaments of other countries possessing nuclear weapons would, in their turn, do everything possible to ensure that the testing

of such weapons cease in their countries. For a number of years the Soviet Union abided by this decision, but the continued testing of atomic weapons by some Western Powers forced the Soviet Government, in the interests of the country's security, to give up the unilateral cessation of tests.

During his trip to the U.S.A. in the autumn of 1959 and prior to the session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., Prime Minister Khrushchov announced from the rostrum of the U.N. General Assembly a programme for general and complete disarmament permeated with profound humanism and a desire to deliver the peoples from the misfortunes of war. The peoples of the world gave this programme a warm welcome. The idea of general and complete disarmament was unanimously approved by the U.N. General Assembly.

There is no doubt that the implementation of this proposal would ensure peace for all peoples. At the same time the Soviet Government was willing to consider other proposals for the purpose of achieving a mutually acceptable solution to the disarmament problem.

Unfortunately, leading Western statesmen did not display a proper understanding of the Soviet initiative. Some prominent people in the Western countries, in their effort to undermine the faith of people in the realistic nature of the Soviet proposals, began to distort their meaning.

A joint meeting of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet on October 31, 1959, heard and discussed a report on the international situation and the foreign policy of the U.S.S.R. delivered by N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. and First Secretary of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.

Khrushchov made a profound and all-round analysis of the world situation and stressed in particular the outstanding importance of Lenin's great concept of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems that in our times has become a real fact. It is an objective necessity deriving from the present stage of development of human society.

"The point at issue now is not whether or not there should be peaceful coexistence," said Khrushchov, "for peaceful coexistence is there, and will be there if we want



to avoid the lunacy of world nuclear and rocket war. The point is to coexist on a reasonable basis."

Coexistence on a rational basis implies: recognition of the fact that there are different systems in the world; recognition of the right of every nation to settle the political and social problems of its own country independently; respect for sovereignty and adherence to the principle of non-intervention in internal affairs; the settlement of all international issues by negotiation; the necessity for mutual concessions in the interests of peace. Khrushchov cited the problem of disarmament as a concrete example of the readiness of the Soviet state to make concessions.

Khrushchov said that he was confident common sense would ultimately prevail and sooner or later rational decisions would be adopted that would make it possible for the peoples to live in friendship, to trust each other and not to interfere in the affairs of other states; he stressed the need to expose the enemies of disarmament, to repulse them resolutely so that the brightest hopes of the peoples may be realised.

In a Message addressed to the parliaments of all countries the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., recording its full approval of the peaceful initiative of the Soviet Government in presenting a programme of general and complete disarmament for examination by the United Nations, expressed its confidence that this splendid initiative, which points out a real way of solving this vitally important problem, would meet with understanding and support among the parliaments and governments of other countries.

At a joint sitting of the two chambers on January 14, 1960, the Supreme Soviet, considering the problem of disarmament to be of primary importance, again took up the question when it heard Prime Minister Khrushchov's report "Disarmament for Durable Peace and Friendship".

He spoke of the magnificent achievements of the Soviet people in the building of communism, gave a picture of the international situation then obtaining and outlined the foreign policy of the Soviet Union; in the name of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. and the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. he submitted for the consideration of the Supreme Soviet new concrete proposals for the reduction of

the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union. These proposals were incorporated in the Law on a Further Considerable Reduction of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. adopted on January 15, 1960, according to which the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. were reduced by 1,200,000 officers and men.

In passing the Law, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. expressed the hope that this new reduction in the armed forces would serve as a convincing example to other states, especially those of the greatest military strength, which would facilitate agreement on general and complete disarmament.

Simultaneously with the Law, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. adopted a Message to the parliaments and governments of all states, calling on them to respond to the initiative of the Soviet Union and in their turn take practical steps towards reducing armed forces, relieving the peoples of the burden of armaments, delivering mankind from the threat of war and ensuring peace throughout the world.

However, neither the Message nor the peace initiative of the Soviet Union met with the support of the parliaments and governments of the Western Powers. The governments of those countries, on the contrary, stepped up the arms race. Under these circumstances the Soviet Government was compelled to take the necessary steps to strengthen the defence potential of the U.S.S.R.

The Soviet Union, true to its Leninist policy of respect for the national rights of all peoples, greeted warmly the appearance of new, independent states, recognised their sovereignty unconditionally, and expressed its readiness to develop relations with them on the basis of complete equality. The Supreme Soviet has heard many Government reports on the foreign policy of the U.S.S.R. and has recorded its approval of all the Soviet measures directed towards support for the countries that have freed themselves from colonial dependence, support for the just struggle of all peoples for national independence and for the complete abolition of colonial oppression in all its forms and manifestations.

The exceptional importance which the supreme organ of state power in the Soviet Union attaches to the solution of major problems of international life may be judged from the discussion of the question of the Geneva talks at the First

Session of the Sixth Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. in April 1962.

The report by A. A. Gromyko, Minister for Foreign Affairs, and the speeches of other deputies, threw further light on the perfectly clear position of the Soviet state on disarmament, the basic problem of the day.

At the first meeting of the Eighteen Nation Committee, the Soviet delegation, on the instructions of its government, presented a concrete draft Treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict international control. This draft contains details of the entire process of disarmament from beginning to end and has been elaborated on the basis of the above-mentioned programme submitted to the United Nations General Assembly by the head of the Soviet Government.

The proposals made by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries participating in the work of the Committee are directed towards a radical solution of the disarmament problem and the urgent conclusion of an agreement on the cessation of nuclear tests for all time.

The sincere desire of the delegations from the socialist states to solve the problem of disarmament without delay came up against a number of obstacles placed in the way of an agreement on disarmament by the representatives of the Western Powers.

The position adopted by the Western Powers in the Eighteen Nation Committee shows that they are not championing the destruction of weapons of war, but favour a continuation of the arms race that they are conducting on an ever growing scale, heating up the international atmosphere and placing ever greater economic burdens on the shoulders of the peoples.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. has always regarded the conclusion of a German peace treaty and the normalisation of the West Berlin situation on the basis of that treaty as being of great importance. On December 25, 1958, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. heard the Government's report in reply to the question of a group of Deputies and approved the policy and practical activities of the Soviet Government; the Supreme Soviet called upon the U.S.A., Great Britain and France to make their contribution to the settlement of the Berlin question in the

interests of the consolidation of peace in Europe and throughout the world. At the First Session of the Sixth Supreme Soviet, held in April 1962, it was stressed that the Soviet proposals on the peaceful settlement of the German question serve the purpose of clearing up the dangerous situation, fraught with possible conflicts and clashes between the powers, that has developed in Central Europe through the fault of the imperialist powers.

Certain forces in the West, however, ignoring the indisputable fact that two sovereign German states have taken shape on the territory of Germany, are doing everything possible to prevent the German peace treaty question from being settled. An irrefutable proof of this is the joint statement adopted in May 1962 by the ministers of the NATO countries at the Athens session of that aggressive bloc.

Imperialist circles, therefore, continue to place their hopes in the arms race and in the "positions of strength" policy that has long since proved bankrupt and still cling to the remnants of the Second World War.

Only those who have lost their sense of the real and cannot or do not want to soberly appraise the situation could fail to see that this policy that has always proved futile in the past is to an even greater extent doomed to failure in our days when superiority in forces is on the side of the Soviet Union and the whole world socialist system, when the neutralist states and the people of all countries are actively struggling for peace.

The First Session of the Sixth Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. approved the Soviet Government's foreign policy aimed at the prevention of war and the consolidation of peace and by so doing once again demonstrated to the whole world its deep concern for the vital interests of the people and the fate of all mankind.

For the Soviet state, its Government and its people, the policy of peace and peaceful coexistence is not merely current politics, it is not something transient, but a general line of foreign policy whose main purpose is to prevent a world war and, furthermore, banish war from the life of society.

The Soviet socialist state considers the struggle for peace to be the chief content, the main idea of its foreign policy. People have dreamed of peace for centuries and have strug-

gled against the evil of war. It is only now when the socialist system has been founded and consolidated as a bulwark of peace and the security of all nations that this dream of the peoples can be realised in the lifetime of our generation.

At the First Session of the Sixth Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., Khrushchov said: "There now exists the world socialist system, a new type of relations between friendly socialist states has grown up, and questions of relations with countries that have freed themselves from colonialism have been presented in a new way. The questions of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and of the struggle for peace have acquired tremendous significance. It is, therefore, obvious that the main principles of the relations between our state and other states must be formulated in the new Constitution."

"I think I am expressing the satisfaction of all deputies of both chambers of the Sixth Supreme Soviet," said Khrushchov, "that this present Supreme Soviet will elaborate, discuss with the whole people and approve the new Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

The Sixth Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., therefore, continues to regard questions of foreign policy to be of primary importance and will give legal force to the noble ideas of the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence in the country's Fundamental Law—the Soviet Constitution.

The acts and documents contained in this collection are proof of the active and tireless work of the Soviet Parliament to ensure peace and the security of all nations.

## DECREE ON PEACE

Adopted by the Second All-Russian  
Congress of Soviets  
on October 26 (November 8), 1917

## DECREE ON PEACE

Adopted by the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets  
on October 26 (November 8), 1917

*(Collection of Laws and Decrees  
by the Workers' and Peasants' Government)*

The Workers' and Peasants' Government, created by the revolution of October 24-25 and based on the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, proposes to all the belligerent peoples and to their governments to begin immediate negotiations for a just and democratic peace.

The Government means by a just or democratic peace, which is desired by the overwhelming majority of the workers and toiling classes of all the belligerent countries, exhausted, tormented and racked by the war—that peace which the Russian workers and peasants have most definitely and insistently demanded ever since the overthrow of the tsarist monarchy—immediate peace without annexations (i.e., without the seizure of foreign lands, without the forcible annexation of other nationalities), and without indemnities.

The Government of Russia proposes to all the belligerent nations to conclude such a peace immediately, and expresses its readiness to take all resolute measures immediately, without the least delay, pending the final ratification of all the terms of such a peace by authoritative assemblies of the people's representatives of all countries and all nations.

Conformable to the concept of justice as understood by democracy in general and by the toiling classes in particular, the Government conceives the annexation or seizure of foreign lands to mean any incorporation of a small or weak nation into a large or powerful state without the precisely, clearly and voluntarily expressed consent and wish of that nation, irrespective of the time such forcible incorporation took place, irrespective also of the degree of development or backwardness of the nation forcibly annexed to the given state, or forcibly retained within its borders, and irrespec-

tive, finally, of whether this nation lives in Europe or in distant, overseas countries.

If any nation whatsoever is retained by force within the borders of another state, if, in spite of its expressed desire—no matter whether expressed in the press, at public assemblies, in the decisions of political parties, or in disorders and uprisings against national oppression—a nation is not accorded the right to decide the forms of its state existence by a free vote, taken without the slightest constraint after the complete evacuation of the troops of the incorporating or, generally, of the stronger nation, such incorporation is annexation, i.e., seizure and violence.

The Government considers it the greatest of crimes against humanity to continue this war over the issue of how the strong and rich nations are to divide the weak nationalities they have conquered, and solemnly announces its determination to sign immediately terms of peace which will put an end to this war on the stated conditions, equally just for all nationalities without exception.

At the same time the Government declares that it does not consider the above-mentioned peace terms an ultimatum; in other words, it is prepared to consider any other terms of peace, insisting only on their being proposed by any of the belligerent countries as speedily as possible, and on there being absolute clarity and the complete absence of all ambiguity and secrecy in the peace proposals.

The Government abolishes secret diplomacy, and announces on its part its firm intention to conduct all negotiations quite openly, in full view of the whole people. The Government will immediately proceed to publish in full the secret treaties endorsed or concluded by the government of landlords and capitalists between February to October 25, 1917. The Government proclaims the unconditional and immediate annulment of everything contained in these secret treaties in so far as they are aimed, in most cases, at securing advantages and privileges for the Russian landlords and capitalists and at the retention, or extension, of the annexations made by the Great Russians.

In making its proposal to the governments and peoples of all countries to begin open negotiations for peace immediately, the Government, on its part, expresses its readiness to conduct these negotiations in writing, by telegraph,

by negotiations between representatives of the various countries, or at a conference of such representatives. To facilitate such negotiations, the Government is appointing its plenipotentiary representatives to neutral countries.

The Government proposes an immediate armistice to the governments and peoples of all the belligerent countries, and, for its part, considers it desirable that this armistice should be concluded for a period of not less than three months, i.e., a period long enough to permit the completion of negotiations for peace with the participation of the representatives of all peoples or nations, without exception, involved in or compelled to take part in the war, and to convene authoritative assemblies of the representatives of the peoples of all countries for the final ratification of the peace terms.

While addressing this proposal for peace to the governments and peoples of all the belligerent countries, the Provisional Workers' and Peasants' Government of Russia also makes a particular Appeal to the class-conscious workers of the three most advanced nations of mankind and the biggest states participating in the present war, Great Britain, France and Germany. The workers of these countries have made the greatest contributions to the cause of progress and socialism; they have furnished the great examples of the Chartist movement in England, a number of revolutions of historic importance effected by the French proletariat, and, finally, the heroic struggle against the Anti-Socialist Law and the prolonged, persistent and disciplined work of creating mass proletarian organisations in Germany, a work which serves as a model to the workers of the whole world. All these examples of proletarian heroism and historical creative activity are a guarantee that the workers of those countries will understand the task of saving mankind from the horrors of war and its consequences that now confronts them, that these workers, by comprehensive, determined, and supremely vigorous action, will help us carry to a successful conclusion the cause of peace, and at the same time the cause of the emancipation of the toiling and exploited masses of the population from all forms of slavery and exploitation.

**SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY**  
**BASIC ACTS AND DOCUMENTS**  
**OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE U.S.S.R.**  
**1956-1962**  
**(in chronological order)**

APPEAL FOR DISARMAMENT  
ADDRESSED BY THE SUPREME SOVIET  
OF THE U.S.S.R.  
TO THE PARLIAMENTS OF ALL COUNTRIES  
OF THE WORLD

Adopted on July 16, 1956

(*Gazette of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.*,  
No. 15, 1956)

Guided by the lofty aims of consolidating peace among the peoples, the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers it its duty to draw the attention of the peoples, governments and parliaments of all countries to the pressing and most important problem of the day, one that is causing grave concern to the peoples of the entire globe, viz., the problem of an end to the arms race, a reduction of armaments, and the banning of nuclear weapons.

The efforts which have been made during the last decade in the United Nations for the achievement of a disarmament agreement have unfortunately not yet been crowned with success.

The arms race—the continuing stockpiling of such weapons of mass destruction as atomic and hydrogen bombs—is still going on in the world. Millions of people are still under arms and parted from their families. All this is a heavy burden on the peoples, is distracting them from creative labour, and is fostering in them a sense of uncertainty of the future and fear of the menace of another war.

In conditions such as these, it is the sacred duty of the parliaments and the governments of all countries, who are responsible to the peoples for the fate of their countries, to take effective measures for an end to the arms race, without waiting for the time when the United Nations will find a solution acceptable to all the nations concerned. This is favoured by the *détente* that has been achieved of late, and by the further development of friendly contacts and good

relations between countries, on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence.

The reductions of armaments separately by each state is an extremely important measure, which creates the conditions for the carrying out of a universal programme of disarmament. In this, the Great Powers, who bear the main responsibility for the preservation and maintenance of world peace, are called upon to play a special part. It is the Great Powers, who possess the biggest armed forces, that must set an example in reducing their armed forces and armaments.

The Soviet Union, which has been consistently pursuing a policy of peace and security for the peoples, has already begun to reduce its armed forces, armaments and expenditures on military needs. Without waiting for a universal agreement on disarmament, the Soviet Union will carry out, before May 1, 1957, over and above the 640,000 reduction in the armed forces effected in 1955, another and still larger reduction in the armed forces, by 1,200,000 men. A corresponding reduction will also be made in armaments and *matériel* and in the Soviet Union's defence expenditures.

The Supreme Soviet approves the Soviet Government's decision to reduce the armed forces and armaments, which it considers an act of goodwill, a most important initiative, which will facilitate the practical solution of the problem of disarmament.

The Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics herewith appeals to the parliaments of all countries to give consideration and backing to the initiative displayed by the Soviet Union, and, in their turn, to take effective steps to put an end to the arms race and reduce armed forces and armaments, thereby making a worthy contribution to the consolidation of peace among the nations.

The Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is convinced that the struggle for the cessation of the arms race will be successful if the parliaments of other states will bend every effort to bring about tangible measures for the achievement of this noble aim.

**STATEMENT**  
**BY THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE U.S.S.R.**  
**IN CONNECTION WITH AN APPEAL**  
**FROM THE JAPANESE DIET**  
**IN THE MATTER OF A BAN ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS**  
**AND DISCONTINUATION OF THEIR TESTING**

Adopted on July 16, 1956

*(Gazette of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.,  
No. 15, 1956)*

As proposed by the Foreign Affairs Committees of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. has given consideration to the resolutions passed by the House of Representatives and the House of Councillors of the Japanese Diet, in February 1956, resolutions which are an expression of the Japanese Diet's desire to bring about a ban on the production and use of nuclear bombs, and a ban on testing of such weapons until an agreement is reached on this question.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. fully understands the grave concern felt by the Japanese people in connection with the continuing arms race and the testing of nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union is of the opinion that only a complete ban on nuclear weapons, i. e., discontinuation of their production, a ban on their use, the destruction of the stockpiles, and their withdrawal from the armaments of states, can rid the peoples of the world of the menace of a devastating atomic war and the grievous consequences to mankind following the use of such weapons.

It is for this reason that in the course of all the post-war years the Soviet Union has been consistently working for a complete ban on atomic weapons and their withdrawal from the armaments of states, and has more than once submitted the appropriate proposals to the United Nations. In particular, the proposal submitted by the Soviet Government



on May 10, 1955 provided for a complete ban on the use and production of nuclear weapons, and their withdrawal from national armaments. It was then too that the Soviet Government proposed that states possessing nuclear weapons should undertake to stop testing of such weapons, as a top-priority measure directed towards implementation of a disarmament programme.

The Soviet Government's proposal of March 27 of the current year also provides for the powers agreeing on the immediate cessation of nuclear weapons tests, irrespective of the achievement of an agreement on other disarmament problems.

These proposals have unfortunately not yet met with the appropriate support, and the problem of the cessation of nuclear weapons tests has not yet been resolved.

All this, however, will not stay the Soviet Union's struggle for a complete ban on atomic weapons and the immediate cessation of nuclear weapons tests as a first step along this path.

It is with satisfaction that the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. takes note of the coincidence of views of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the people of Japan in this highly important matter, and expresses the hope that the stand taken by the Soviet Union and Japan in this noble cause will be actively supported by the parliaments of other countries.

**QUESTION  
TABLED BY A GROUP OF DEPUTIES  
TO THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE U.S.S.R.  
AND ADDRESSED TO THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT  
IN THE MATTER OF THE CESSATION  
OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS**

May 9, 1957

*(Sittings of the Seventh Session  
of the Fourth Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.  
Verbatim Record)*

"At the Fifth Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. a group of Deputies submitted a question to the Soviet Government as to the steps the Government intends to take for the achievement of the universal cessation of atomic testing. Replying to this question, the Soviet Government stated that it considered necessary the immediate conclusion of an agreement between the three powers—the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A. and Great Britain—on the immediate and undelayed cessation of all tests and experimental explosions of atomic and thermonuclear weapons, and addressed an appropriate proposal to the governments of the powers named above.

"Although ten months have elapsed since this question was discussed, we must regretfully note that, in view of the stand taken by the Western Powers, the Soviet Government's efforts have not yet led to the achievement of an agreement. Moreover, preparations for atomic warfare have been stepped up in a number of capitalist countries, first and foremost in the U.S.A.

"This state of affairs is a cause of ever greater concern to the peoples, who are resolutely demanding a ban on nuclear weapons, as weapons of mass destruction, and insist on the immediate cessation of testing such weapons.

"We therefore request the Soviet Government to inform the Deputies as to how matters stand at present in respect

of the achievement of an international agreement on an end to nuclear weapons tests, and also regarding the obstacles to an agreement on this problem.

*"V. Grishin, A. Korneichuk, A. Sembaev,  
V. Ambartsumyan, L. Leonov, P. Bykov,  
G. Burkatskaya, A. Shelepin."*

## STATEMENT

by A. A. Gromyko, Minister for Foreign Affairs  
of the U.S.S.R.,  
in Reply to a Question to the Soviet Government,  
Tabled by a Group of Deputies,  
on the Cessation of Nuclear Weapons Tests,  
Made at the Seventh Joint Session of the Fourth Supreme  
Soviet of the U.S.S.R.,  
May 10, 1957

*(Sittings of the Seventh Session  
of the Fourth Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.  
Verbatim Record)*

Comrade Deputies:

I have been instructed by the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. to make a Statement in connection with a question tabled by a group of Deputies and addressed to the Government, regarding the banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests.

It must in the first place be stated that the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. is in agreement with the opinion expressed by the group of Deputies, that a ban on nuclear weapons testing is an important international problem, which has very rightly drawn the attention of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.

This matter has long been a source of concern to broad international public opinion. This can be readily understood since it is linked up with the international negotiations that have for a lengthy period of time been held on disarmament, the most burning problem of the day.

The fact that with every day the resources of a number of states are being to an ever greater extent diverted to the production of dangerous and destructive types of weapons is no longer a secret. This refers particularly to atomic and hydrogen weapons. You are well aware that the Soviet Union has also been forced to produce both atomic and hydrogen

weapons. It has been forced to do so by the present international situation, and first and foremost by the policy of keeping the world "on the brink of war" which is being pursued by certain powers, the United States in the first place. It has been forced to do so by the rivalry, fostered by aggressive circles in certain countries, between the Great Powers in the production of the most deadly types of weapons of mass destruction.

It is common knowledge that, following from its policy of peace and international co-operation, the Soviet Union has consistently stood for the necessity of a complete and unconditional ban on nuclear weapons, so that they should be withdrawn from the armaments of nations. The Western Powers, and in the first place the U.S.A., have stubbornly objected to a ban on such weapons, and are frustrating the achievement of the necessary international agreement. To this day they have been piling up one obstruction on another with the purpose of foiling any agreement, and meanwhile they have been building ever greater stockpiles of such weapons.

All sorts of pretexts have been brought forward to frustrate any understanding on this problem. The Western Powers now link up the problem of nuclear weapons with the problem of so-called conventional armaments, now separate these two issues.

As soon as the prospect arises of a rapprochement between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers in this or any other problem, the latter powers very soon reject their own proposals on various pretexts, as a result of which a new gulf yawns between their new position and that of the Soviet Union.

It would be premature to draw any definite conclusion regarding the possible outcome of the present disarmament talks in London. The immediate future will show whether we shall have a repetition of what has so often taken place in the past, or whether the Western Powers will show genuine readiness for serious negotiations and for an agreement which, as we are profoundly convinced, these powers are interested in no less than the Soviet Union, from the viewpoint of the interests of the peoples, and not those of a handful of monopolies, who rake in tremendous profits from war orders. Let us hope that a sober approach to the

solution of the disarmament problem will gain the upper hand, in particular a sober approach to the solution of the problem of nuclear weapons, including the problem of an end to their testing.

Meanwhile the Soviet Union is constrained to proceed from the fact that no agreement has been reached between the powers either on the problem of a reduction in the strength of the armed forces, though, as is known, the U.S.S.R. has unilaterally effected a substantial reduction in the strength of its armed forces, or on the question of nuclear weapons. This means that, in the interests of its security and of the socialist camp as a whole, and also in the interests of the maintenance of universal peace, our country has to continue production of atomic and hydrogen weapons, and, moreover, to produce new types of nuclear bombs and new types of rockets and missiles, and also to build up its defensive might in every way.

The Soviet Union too conducts tests of nuclear weapons. It cannot act otherwise in view of the fact that such tests are also carried out by the other powers that manufacture such weapons, namely, the United States of America and Great Britain. At the same time the Soviet Union has more than once proposed discontinuation of nuclear tests, if the U.S.A. and Great Britain will also agree to that.

Moreover, the Soviet Government has proposed that the problem of an end to nuclear testing should be treated as a separate problem, and that an understanding on this problem should not be made to hinge on an understanding on other disarmament problems.

What is the advantage of the issue being presented in this way? It is that this will permit immediate cessation of tests, which will meet the lawful and ever increasing demand of the peoples.

The problem of an end to nuclear testing has also been under discussion for several years. The overwhelming majority of the population of the world have come out in favour of an end to such testing. This has been insisted on by the peoples of Japan, India, Indonesia and other Afro-Asian states. The peoples of Britain, France, the U.S.A. and other countries in Europe and America are ever more insistently presenting the same demand. It goes without saying that the

proposal for an end to nuclear tests finds full and active support from the peoples of the Soviet Union and of all the other countries of the socialist camp.

Anxious to facilitate the achievement of an understanding in this matter with the U.S.A. and Great Britain, the Soviet Government recently proposed to these powers that agreement should be reached at least on the suspension of nuclear tests for a definite period.

To this day, however, neither of these proposals has found support from the governments of the U.S.A. and Great Britain.

What are the reasons brought forward by the Western Powers when they object to an agreement on the ending of nuclear tests? It is usually asserted that undetectable nuclear tests are possible. This argument, however, contradicts the facts.

To date there has not been a single instance of nuclear blasts not being detected with the aid of the appropriate scientific and technical apparatus. This means that the reason I have mentioned was made use of only to foster doubt of the possibility of an effective agreement on an end to atomic and hydrogen weapons tests, and to mislead public opinion on that score. Certain quarters in the West have made wide use of this argument of late, in view of the wave of protests that has been rising against the British Government's decision to conduct hydrogen tests in the area of Christmas Island in the Pacific. I will remind you that, in connection with this plan of the British Government, a huge area in the Pacific has been closed by the British to shipping, fishing and flying.

Opponents to an agreement on an end to nuclear tests use yet another argument: they question the possibility of such an agreement, inasmuch as cessation of nuclear testing, they say with alarm, must raise the issue of a complete ban on such weapons.

Those who bank on such weapons, pay homage to them, and praise them in every possible key, as a means of intimidation and of fanning the "cold war", fear nothing so much as a ban on atomic weapons, and do not agree that testing of such weapons should be stopped. They realise that even the first step towards a ban on nuclear weapons would undermine the position of supporters of the arms race and of all kinds

of adventurers, who are ready to let loose upon the peoples all the horrors of atomic war.

The peoples, who are very rightly anxious about the fate of the world, would only welcome such results; they would welcome not only the ending of nuclear tests, but also the complete and unconditional banning of such weapons and their withdrawal from national armaments.

Besides allaying anxiety regarding the effects of nuclear explosions on human health, a ban on such tests would exert a beneficial and refreshing influence on the entire international situation. The fact that a test ban would in its turn raise the issue of a complete ban on atomic weapons would be an important step forward in the struggle to rid mankind of the menace of atomic warfare.

Of course, neither the U.S. nor the British Government would object to the Soviet Union unilaterally ending nuclear tests. That obviously could not be done, since in that case the Soviet Union would find itself in unequal and disadvantageous position. It would be detrimental to the security of the Soviet Union and at the same time would encourage a build-up in the Western Powers' war preparations, thereby increasing the threat of an atomic war. That is why those who demand that the Soviet Union should unilaterally end testing of nuclear weapons are asking for too much.

We want what is called fair play. We say to our partners: we are ending explosions, and you do the same. If you continue to conduct testing of such weapons, we too in that case will make such tests. Other countries should be interested no less than the Soviet Union in an end to nuclear tests.

The attitude towards the problem of the cessation of nuclear tests shows the alignment of international forces in the struggle for peace. Those forces that stand for a relaxation of international tension and are opposed to the adventurist policy from "positions of strength", to the arms race, and to propaganda for a new war, are also demanding an end to nuclear tests. It should be noted in this connection that the demand for an end to nuclear tests is being voiced by quite a number of people who, while often not active supporters of an end to an arms race, nevertheless realise that something must be done to remove the danger of a destructive atomic war, and that the ending of nuclear testing would be a step in this direction.

The forces that stubbornly insist on the arms race being continued and want the "cold war" exacerbated, forces that are working for preparations for atomic warfare, are also opposed to any cessation of nuclear tests.

The worthlessness of another argument often brought forward by opponents to cessation of testing such weapons must be shown up. Reference is made to the need to limit the problem to an agreement on mutual registration of nuclear blasts, with advance notice of planned testing of such bombs. This proposal is meant to evade the issue. The core of the problem is not simple registration of nuclear blasts, since the most punctilious registration, in accordance with all U.N. rules, will be useless; the essential thing is that such tests must be banned.

An agreement on registration would simply create a semblance of something being done, while nothing would actually be done to remove the threat of atomic warfare and to make the international situation healthier. Moreover, such an agreement would create a false situation, as it would in fact encourage the legalisation, in a certain sense, of nuclear weapons and thereby hamper the struggle for a final ban on this weapon of mass destruction.

While attaching great importance to a positive solution of the problem of an end to nuclear tests, the Soviet Government expects the U.S. and British Governments to change their present stand and enter into an agreement on this question. As previously, the Soviet Union will continue to wage a consistent struggle for a ban on nuclear weapons and for the implementation of any step that will facilitate the achievement of this aim and help remove the menace of an atomic war, with all its grave consequences for the peoples. The Soviet Government is convinced that this policy is in accordance with the profound interests of all peoples, who hate and curse war, and are anxiously awaiting the advent of the day when they can breathe freely, without the shadow of a new military threat falling on them.

Such, Comrade Deputies, is the position of the Soviet Government in the question raised by a group of Deputies. It is an expression of the Soviet steadfast and consistent policy, which is directed towards relaxation of international tension, an end to the arms race and the consolidation of peace among the peoples. (*Stormy applause.*)

## RESOLUTION OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE U.S.S.R.

Adopted on May 10, 1957

(*Gazette of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.,  
No. 11, 1957*)

Following a discussion on a question tabled by Deputies to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. Grishin, Korneichuk, Sembaev, Ambartsumyan, Leonov, Bykov, Burkatskaya and Shelepin on the measures to be taken to achieve a cessation of nuclear tests, and after hearing a statement by Comrade Gromyko, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. hereby resolves:

that the policy and practical measures of the Soviet Government in the problem of the immediate and universal cessation of nuclear weapons be approved.

**MESSAGE**  
**BY THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE U.S.S.R.**  
**TO THE U.S. CONGRESS**  
**AND THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT**

Adopted on May 10, 1957

*(Gazette of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.,  
No. 11, 1957)*

The Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is addressing the present Message to the Congress of the United States of America and to the British Parliament, in the confidence that it will meet with due understanding and a favourable reply.

The Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics holds that, in the international situation obtaining today, the parliaments of our three states should reveal the highest understanding of their responsibility for the fate of world peace and the prevention of the danger now threatening mankind.

Like the peoples of the U.S.A. and Great Britain, as well as millions of men and women in all other countries, the Soviet people are watching with ever greater concern the entry of the arms race into a highly dangerous stage.

The production and stockpiling is ever expanding of new types of weapons possessing tremendous destructive force, such as atomic and hydrogen bombs, intercontinental missiles, and other means of mass destruction.

Mankind had entered a period when any war in which nuclear weapons are used threatens the extermination of millions upon millions of people, the devastation of entire countries, and destruction of great and unique cultural values.

World public opinion is experiencing grave and justified concern over the danger created by nuclear tests.

Although the consequences of such tests have not been sufficiently studied, prominent world scientists are already

warning that continuation of such testing is a threat to human health.

The arms race is engendering mistrust and suspicion in the relations between states, is poisoning the international atmosphere. It is sowing fear and uncertainty, and is preventing people from working and living in peace of mind. In all countries mothers are alarmed for the fate of their children, and young people, for their own future. The production of expensive nuclear weapons is a heavy burden on taxpayers, who are obliged to divert from their own budgets ever greater sums for the arms build-up.

The most varied sections of the population in all countries of the world are insistently demanding that an end be put to the nuclear race, and that the calamity threatening mankind be averted.

Unfortunately, there are still certain political and military circles that are trying to persuade the peoples that nuclear war is inevitable, and that it is impossible to halt nuclear rivalry. This, however, is a false assertion, one that is calculated to paralyse the determination of the peoples to preserve and consolidate world peace. Nuclear war can and must be prevented. An important contribution to this can be made by parliaments, which have an influence on the policies of their countries.

The peoples are justly placing particular hope on responsible quarters in the U.S.A., Great Britain and the U.S.S.R., countries in possession of nuclear weapons. Today, in the very beginning of the atomic era, when nuclear weapons are as yet produced only by three states, it is comparatively easy to reach an understanding on measures to prevent nuclear war. The peoples of the world look to the United Nations to play its part in resolving the disarmament problem.

In its Appeal of July 16, 1956, the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics already had occasion to draw the attention of the parliaments of all countries to the problem of disarmament and to a nuclear ban.

Desirous of facilitating the solution of the disarmament problem as a whole, the Soviet Union, as is common knowledge, has declared itself willing to halt nuclear tests immediately, irrespective of whether an agreement on the problem of nuclear weapons is achieved or not.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., which fully approves this step by the Soviet Government, appeals to the Congress of the United States and the British Parliament to help in the achievement of an agreement between the governments of the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A. and Great Britain on the immediate cessation of nuclear tests, and to take such steps that they may consider necessary with this end in view.

For its part, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. requests that the parliaments of the U.S.A. and Great Britain should give consideration to the creation of an inter-parliamentary committee of the U.S.A., Great Britain and the U.S.S.R. for an exchange of opinions on possible ways and means of bringing about a discontinuation of nuclear weapons tests and the banning of such weapons.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. expresses the hope that the U.S. Congress and the British Parliament will take all possible steps for this problem to be resolved without delay, in accordance with the will of the peoples.

MESSAGE  
OF THE SUPREME SOVIET  
OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS  
TO ALL WORKING PEOPLE, POLITICAL AND PUBLIC  
LEADERS, WORKERS IN SCIENCE AND CULTURE,  
PARLIAMENTS AND GOVERNMENTS  
OF ALL COUNTRIES

Adopted on November 6, 1957

*(Gazette of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.,  
No. 25, 1957)*

The first socialist state of the working people in the world came into being in Russia 40 years ago, at the height of the world war, and its first legislative act was the historic Decree on Peace, written by Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. Shortly afterwards, the Soviet state in the Declaration of the Rights of the Nations of Russia put forward a programme for the establishment of genuinely equal and friendly relations among the nations.

The foundations of a new foreign policy without precedent in history were thus laid, the policy of the working class, of all the working people vitally interested in the establishment of peace and friendship among the nations. This initiated the Leninist peaceable foreign policy of the Soviet state.

The young Soviet Republic, weak as yet but full of faith in the historic justice of its cause, offered peace and co-operation to all the states. But when it was attacked by counter-revolutionary forces and armed intervention was organised against it, the Republic of Soviets proved that it was capable of defending itself and upholding its socialist gains.

Today the Soviet Union, which accomplished great changes under the leadership of the Communist Party, is a mighty socialist state, it is in its prime and has loyal friends all over the world. Today, 40 years after the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets which approved the Decree on Peace,

the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics appeals to all the peoples tirelessly to strengthen the cause of peace, to develop friendship and co-operation among the nations in every way.

The socialist state of the working people is upholding the cause of peace; aggressive aspirations are alien to it and it needs no colonies or spheres of influence. It organically opposes any enslavement and national oppression. The Great October Socialist Revolution has ushered in the epoch of liberation of all the working people from exploitation, the liberation of the oppressed peoples from colonial bondage.

The peoples of the Soviet Union regard with sympathy the liberation movement of the peoples in the colonial and dependent countries and deeply understand their striving for national independence, their desire to save their natural wealth from looting by the imperialist monopolies.

The first half of the 20th century was marked by epoch-making events which are exerting a tremendous influence on the destinies of all mankind. The victory of the people's revolution in China and the formation of the Chinese People's Republic represented the most momentous historical event after the Great October Socialist Revolution. The working people of Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, the German Democratic Republic, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia have embarked on the road of building socialism. Relations of fraternal friendship and mutual assistance, based on equality, on the principles of socialist internationalism, have been established between the peoples of these countries.

The age of socialism, of which the finest minds of mankind have dreamed for centuries, has arrived. It has brought about a great advance of the productive forces, steady improvement in the welfare of the working people and rapid development of science, technology and culture. All progressive people are warmly congratulating the Soviet Union on the launching of artificial Earth satellites, which ushered in the age of interplanetary communication. This is a source of great rejoicing for the Soviet people. But we realise that only in a peaceful world can the greatest accomplishments of science—the use of nuclear energy, intercontinental rockets

and sputniks—be placed at the service of, and bring good to, all mankind.

All the peoples need peace. The peoples of the Soviet Union too need peace to build a new, more wonderful and radiant future.

The Soviet Union's peace-loving policy unfortunately is constantly resisted by influential elements in the Western countries, above all in the United States whose ruling circles lay claim to leadership over the entire world, that is, to world supremacy. Naturally, no freedom-loving people can consent to any alien leadership, which results in the loss of national independence.

The Soviet state has never claimed and does not claim leadership over other countries. It respects the independence and sovereignty of all states and seeks to develop friendly relations with all countries. It wholeheartedly approves and supports the well-known five principles of peaceful coexistence: mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression, non-intervention in each other's domestic affairs, equality and mutual benefit, peaceful coexistence. These principles have been widely recognised by the peoples in Asian and African countries who have won great victories in the struggle for their freedom, independence and the consolidation of peace. The peoples of India, Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon, Afghanistan, Egypt, Syria and other countries are making their big contribution to the prevention of another war and to the great and lofty cause of peace.

The peoples of the Soviet Union note with deep satisfaction that, together with them, the peoples of all the socialist states are working consistently and steadfastly for peace. Many non-socialist peaceable states and the great world-wide peace movement are actively working for peace.

But there still are forces in the world which impede an easing of international tension, wage the "cold war" and continue the arms race, creating the danger of another devastating war.

Peace must be ensured, and it can be ensured, by uniting all the peace-loving forces, by improving their organisation and stimulating their activities.

Workers and peasants, scientists, writers, artists and other workers in culture, members of parliament in all countries, the removal of the danger of another war and the estab-



ishment of a lasting peace depends upon ourselves, upon our joint efforts.

People of goodwill, it is within your power to call to order the political leaders and statesmen who do not reckon with the interests of the peoples and gamble with their destinies. It is high time to discard the "positions of strength" policy and replace it with a policy of peaceful coexistence, a policy of establishing relations of confidence between states, of co-operation and friendship among the nations.

We, Deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., are deeply convinced that these thoughts and sentiments will strike a wide echo in the hearts of all who prize peace and friendship among the peoples.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. appeals to all the peoples, all workers and peasants, all workers in science and culture, political and public leaders, parliaments and governments of all countries

*to work persistently for the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and for international co-operation;*

*to seek a general reduction of armaments and armed forces and prohibition of atomic and thermonuclear weapons;*

*to seek agreement on the immediate discontinuance of atomic and thermonuclear weapons tests;*

*to establish a collective security system in Europe and Asia;*

*to promote economic and cultural ties, to strengthen trust among the nations in every way.*

Aware of its responsibility and the full gravity of the present international situation, the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics appeals to all peace-loving people to launch energetic action to prevent another war.

*The cause of peace is in the hands of the peoples themselves!*

*Peoples of all countries, unite your efforts to safeguard world peace!*

**RESOLUTION  
OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE U.S.S.R.  
ON THE FOREIGN POLICY  
OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT**

Adopted on December 21, 1957

*(Gazette of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.,  
No. 28, 1957)*

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. hereby fully approves the Soviet Government's activities in the sphere of foreign policy.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. fully supports the proposals, expounded in the messages and notes sent by the Government of the U.S.S.R. to the Governments of the member states of the United Nations, as conforming to the task of easing international tension, ending the "cold war" and the arms race, the task of extending peaceful co-operation among all states.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., expressing the unbending will and unanimous striving of the Soviet people for peace, believes that at present when the arms race still continues, especially in atomic and thermonuclear weapons, measures must be taken to prevent a dangerous course of events, to uphold peace and deliver mankind from the threat of a devastating atomic war. In line with this aim would be:

1. renunciation of the use of atomic and thermonuclear weapons by the powers possessing these weapons—the U.S.S.R., the United States and Great Britain;

2. an undertaking by the U.S.S.R., the United States and Great Britain to stop all tests of atomic and thermonuclear weapons as of January 1, 1958;

3. agreement of the U.S.S.R., the United States and Great Britain on the renunciation of the deployment of any nuclear weapons in the territory of Germany—both West and East—and acceptance of the proposal of Poland, Czecho-

slovakia and the German Democratic Republic on the renunciation of the production and deployment of nuclear weapons in the territory of these countries and of West Germany;

4. substantial reduction of national armed forces and armaments, in the first place of the Great Powers which have the largest armed forces;

5. non-aggression agreement between member states of the North Atlantic alliance and member states of the Warsaw Treaty;

6. understanding not to take any steps violating the independence of the Middle Eastern countries and to renounce the use of force in settling questions pertaining to this area;

7. discontinuation of war propaganda in countries where it is still conducted, and the utmost expansion of trade, scientific and cultural relations between states.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. is convinced that personal meetings of leaders of the powers and discussion by them of urgent international problems would facilitate the finding of ways and means to ease the existing international tension and strengthen confidence between states.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. notes with great satisfaction that the peace initiative of the Soviet Union finds understanding and support among the broadest international circles which see that in our day there is only one way to avoid atomic war — the way of peaceful coexistence. It is increasingly recognised that in the prevailing situation when the capitalist and the socialist systems exist in the world, any attempt forcibly to change this situation from the outside, any attempt to intervene in the domestic affairs of other states with the object of changing their political regimes, any attempt to impose some kind of territorial changes, to upset the present *status quo* would lead to disastrous consequences for universal peace.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. notes with satisfaction that the session of the U.N. General Assembly which just closed, having examined the question of peaceful coexistence of states, came out in support of the principles of peaceful coexistence and passed a resolution recognising the need for developing relations between states on the basis of mutual respect and benefit, non-aggression, mutual respect for sovereignty, equality and territorial integrity and

non-interference in each other's domestic affairs. The Assembly appealed to all states to bend every effort to strengthen international peace and develop friendly relations and co-operation and also to resolve disputes by peaceful means.

The adoption of such a resolution by the United Nations reflects the tremendous world-wide spread of demands to end the arms race, to find ways and means for a peaceful settlement of disputed questions, to check the dangerous development of events towards another war and to prevent its outbreak. The Supreme Soviet notes that these sentiments have also been reflected in the pronouncements, made by some statesmen of member countries of the North Atlantic alliance at the NATO Council session in Paris, in favour of accepting the Soviet Government's proposal for talks between the powers. Although the decisions of the NATO Council session do mention the advisability of talks with the Soviet Union on disarmament, they are largely aimed at further conducting the war preparations by member states of the North Atlantic alliance and testify to the intention of the powers leading in NATO to continue their peace-endangering policy.

Guided by the lofty aims of strengthening universal peace, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. voices the hope that the parliaments and governments of all countries will examine with due attention the proposals put forward by the Soviet Union and will do everything in their power to reduce international tension, refraining from steps that could complicate relations between states.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. has taken cognisance of statements made by leaders of member countries of the North Atlantic alliance to the effect that these countries adhere to positions of the non-use of force in their relations with other states. This shows that a sober approach to solving international problems is increasingly breaking its way through. Taking into account these statements and hoping that they will be embodied in practical steps by NATO member states, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., in an effort to make another important contribution to strengthening peace and creating a climate of international trust, instructs the Soviet Government to examine the question of further cutting the armed forces of the Soviet Union, keeping, until international agreement on disarmament is

reached, the remaining armed forces and armaments at a requisite level fully ensuring the defence interests of the Soviet Union.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. expects the United States, Great Britain and France, for their part, to take steps to cut their armed forces and thereby to contribute to creating genuine international security.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. expresses confidence that the efforts of the peoples of the Soviet Union, People's China and the other socialist states, combined with the efforts of the other peoples who are upholding the lofty cause of peace and friendship among all nations, will be crowned with success and mankind, delivered from the threat of another war, will be able to dedicate all its energies wholly to peaceful endeavour.

**RESOLUTION  
OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE U.S.S.R.  
ON THE UNILATERAL DISCONTINUATION  
OF ATOMIC AND THERMONUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS  
BY THE SOVIET UNION**

Adopted on March 31, 1958

*(Gazette of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.,  
No. 7, 1958)*

The ending of atomic and thermonuclear weapons tests is acquiring ever greater importance for peace and the welfare of the peoples with each passing year, each passing month.

Today the overwhelming majority of mankind is demanding an end to the tests. Despite the fact that for many years the peoples have been persistently calling for a cessation of these tests, they are continued, which leads to the manufacture of ever new types of lethal nuclear weapons, increases the concentration of radioactive elements in the atmosphere and soil, poisons the organism of people and threatens the normal development of future generations.

The Soviet Union has steadfastly and consistently worked to reach agreement with the other powers possessing atomic and thermonuclear weapons on the immediate and unconditional discontinuation of their tests. To these ends the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. and the Soviet Government in recent years have repeatedly made concrete proposals on the ending of the tests, proposals on the basis of which understanding on this matter could have been reached long ago.

In a Message to the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Great Britain, of May 10, 1957, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. called upon the U.S. Congress and the British Parliament to facilitate agreement between the Governments of the U.S.S.R., the United States and Great Britain on the immediate discontinuation of experimental explosions of A- and H-bombs.

At its previous session in December last the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., expressing the unbending will and unanimous striving of the Soviet people for peace, proposed that the U.S.S.R., Great Britain and the United States undertake to stop all tests of atomic and thermonuclear weapons as of January 1, 1958.

But the United States and Great Britain did not respond to all these proposals of the Soviet Union. As a result, experimental explosions of A- and H-bombs continue now in one now in another part of the world, which attests to the further acceleration of the race in developing still more dangerous weapons of mass destruction.

Guided by a desire actually to initiate a universal discontinuation of atomic and thermonuclear weapons tests and thereby make the first step towards finally delivering mankind from the threat of a devastating atomic war, the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics hereby *resolves*:

1. To discontinue tests of all kinds of atomic and thermonuclear weapons in the Soviet Union.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. expects the parliaments of other states possessing atomic and thermonuclear weapons, for their part, to do everything necessary so that these countries too stop all experimental explosions of these weapons.

2. To instruct the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. to take the necessary steps to implement Paragraph 1 of the present Resolution and to appeal to the governments of other states possessing atomic and thermonuclear weapons to take similar measures to ensure the discontinuation of tests of atomic and thermonuclear weapons everywhere and for all time.

If the other powers possessing atomic and thermonuclear weapons continue to test them, the Government of the U.S.S.R. naturally will be free to act in the matter of tests of atomic and thermonuclear weapons by the Soviet Union, in conformity with the above circumstances and bearing in mind the security interests of the Soviet Union.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. sincerely hopes that the initiative of the Soviet Union in ending nuclear weapons tests will be given due support by the parliaments of other states.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. is deeply convinced that if in response to the Soviet Government's decision, the other states possessing nuclear weapons, for their part, end the tests of these arms, an important practical step will thereby be made in strengthening peace and the security of all the nations. This step undoubtedly would be of great importance for normalising the entire international climate, would help relieve mankind of the oppressive anxiety for the future of the world, for the future of succeeding generations.

**ADDRESS**  
**OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE U.S.S.R.**  
**TO THE CONGRESS OF THE U.S.A.**  
**ON ENDING NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS**

Adopted on March 31, 1958

*(Gazette of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.,  
No. 7, 1958)*

The Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addresses the Congress of the United States of America on the question of ending atomic and thermonuclear weapons tests which is now deeply agitating all mankind. The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. expresses its firm conviction that a solution to this problem depends above all on the achievement of agreement between the Soviet Union, the United States of America and Great Britain. It is this circumstance that places special responsibility on these three states to the peoples of all countries.

In its Message to the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Great Britain, of May 10, 1957, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. already had the opportunity to draw attention to the fact that world public opinion is deeply disturbed by the danger inherent in nuclear weapons tests which are still continued, and it proposed that agreed measures leading to a cessation of these tests be taken.

On December 21, 1957, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. adopted a Resolution, proposing that the U.S.S.R., the United States and Great Britain undertake to discontinue all tests of atomic and thermonuclear weapons as of January 1, 1958.

Had this proposal been accepted by the United States and Great Britain, an end would have already been put to the dangerous experiments with nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, owing to the attitude of the United States and Great Britain, no understanding on this question has been reached so far. Yet, the rumble of experimental explosions of A- and

H-bombs continues to resound now in one part of the globe, demonstrating that the contest in devising the most lethal kinds of mass-destruction weapons is developing with growing intensity. Each new explosion of a nuclear device covers the earth with a fresh layer of radioactive fallout, endangering the health of the present and future generations.

Is it surprising then that the question of ending nuclear tests continues to be in the focus of attention of the peoples the world over? Numerous public leaders and thousands of outstanding workers in science of many countries, including world-renowned scientists of the United States, point to the pressing need for promptly ending the tests of atomic and thermonuclear weapons. They stress that a solution of this problem brooks no delay, because the continuation of the tests can inflict irreparable harm.

Agreement among the powers on ending nuclear weapons tests is fully feasible already in the existing conditions. It would not be prejudicial to any signatory to such an agreement and would not give any state any unilateral advantage over the others. At the same time understanding on this question would pave the way to further, broader disarmament measures. These arguments have also been voiced by prominent political leaders and members of the U.S. Congress who advocate a settlement of the question of ending nuclear tests independent of other disarmament problems.

To reach agreement on stopping the tests of atomic and thermonuclear weapons is still relatively simple now also because at present only three powers possess such weapons and test them. If after a certain time other states too produce nuclear weapons, it naturally will be more difficult to reach understanding on ending the tests.

Guided by a desire actually to initiate a universal ending of nuclear weapons tests and thereby make the first step towards the final deliverance of mankind from the threat of a devastating atomic war, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. has adopted a decision on the unilateral discontinuation of atomic and thermonuclear weapons tests by the Soviet Union.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. calls upon the Congress of the United States of America in the interests of all mankind to support this initiative which conforms

to the aspirations of millions upon millions of people in all countries. Simultaneously the Supreme Soviet is also sending an Address on this question to the Parliament of Great Britain and the parliaments of other countries.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. is deeply convinced that if in response to the Soviet Union's decision, the United States and Great Britain, as countries possessing nuclear weapons, for their part, stop testing such weapons, thereby the question of the universal ending of tests of atomic and thermonuclear weapons for all time will be settled. This will be an important step forward in ending the race in atomic and thermonuclear armaments and in consolidating the security of all the peoples. Such a step will undoubtedly be of great importance for normalising the entire international climate and thereby will contribute to the solution of many other outstanding international problems.

It goes without saying that if other states do not respond to this humane decision of the Soviet Union and prefer, as hitherto, to continue experimental explosions of atomic and thermonuclear weapons, the Soviet Government will be free to act in the matter of nuclear tests by the Soviet Union in conformity with the above circumstances and bearing in mind the security interests of the U.S.S.R. But the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. believes that the initiative in ending nuclear weapons tests displayed by the Soviet Union will be supported by corresponding steps of the United States and Great Britain.

Aware of the great responsibility of legislative bodies to the peoples for the great cause of maintaining and strengthening peace, the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addresses an insistent appeal to the Congress of the United States of America to wield all its influence so that the question of ending the tests of atomic and thermonuclear weapons by all states for all time, should, at long last, be finally settled in conformity with the aspirations of the peoples.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. would want to hope that our two countries, the Soviet Union and the United States of America, which were the first to develop nuclear weapons, will also be the first to end the tests of these weapons and thereby will justify the hopes not only of the peoples of both our countries, but also of all mankind.

## ADDRESS

### OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE U.S.S.R. TO THE PARLIAMENT OF GREAT BRITAIN ON ENDING NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS

Adopted on March 31, 1958

*(Gazette of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.,  
No. 7, 1958)*

The Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics again addresses the Parliament of Great Britain on a question which today is agitating the peoples of all countries and is directly affecting the vital interests of every human being—the question of ending the tests of atomic and thermonuclear weapons.

In view of the important part which Great Britain as a state possessing nuclear weapons could play in settling the question of discontinuing atomic weapons tests, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. on May 10, 1957, proposed to the Parliament of Great Britain to take concerted measures to stop nuclear tests.

On December 21, 1957, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. adopted a Resolution proposing that the U.S.S.R., Great Britain and the United States undertake to end all tests of atomic and thermonuclear weapons as of January 1, 1958.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. notes with deep regret that Great Britain and the United States have not expressed readiness to assume the above undertaking and thus the settlement of the matter of ending the dangerous experiments with nuclear weapons has again been put off. The result is that tests of atomic and thermonuclear weapons not only continue, but are assuming an ever wider scale.

These tests help develop increasingly destructive models of nuclear weapons, subjecting the peoples of the world to ever more horrible danger. Experimental explosions of nuclear weapons are inflicting harm on mankind already now, in peace-time conditions. Each explosion of an A- or H-bomb

increases the quantity of radioactive fallout in the atmosphere and on the ground, which perniciously affects the health of the people living today and their posterity.

Hence, it is fully understandable that continuation of the nuclear tests disturbs and alarms the people. Outstanding scientists of many countries, including Great Britain, who better than anyone else can appreciate the real danger of nuclear weapons tests, point to the pressing need for stopping such tests at once. They draw attention to the fact that the solution of this problem brooks no delay, because the continuation of the tests could inflict irreparable harm. The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. thinks that no one has a right to ignore these warnings.

Nor can one ignore the fact that today it is relatively simple to reach agreement on ending the tests, inasmuch as the number of powers manufacturing nuclear weapons is limited to three. After a certain time other states too might launch the production of nuclear weapons, which naturally could not but make it more difficult to reach understanding on the cessation of nuclear tests.

Guided by a desire actually to initiate the universal discontinuation of nuclear weapons tests and thereby make the first step towards the final deliverance of mankind from the threat of a devastating atomic war, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. has adopted a decision on the unilateral discontinuation of atomic and thermonuclear weapons tests by the Soviet Union.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. urges the Parliament of Great Britain in the interests of all mankind to support this move which conforms to the aspirations of millions upon millions of people in all countries. The Supreme Soviet is also sending an Address on this question to the Congress of the United States of America and to the parliaments of other countries.

If in response to the Soviet Union's decision, Great Britain and the United States as countries possessing nuclear weapons, for their part, stop the testing of such arms, the question of ending the tests of atomic and thermonuclear weapons everywhere and for all time will be settled. A great step towards strengthening peace and the security of all the peoples will thereby be made. The first concrete measures designed to limit the race in atomic armaments will undoubt-

edly be of great importance for normalising the entire international climate, which, in turn, will contribute to solving many other outstanding international problems.

It goes without saying that if other states do not want to respond to this humane decision of the Soviet Union and prefer, as hitherto, to continue experimental explosions of atomic and thermonuclear weapons, the Soviet Government will be free to act in the matter of nuclear tests by the Soviet Union in conformity with the above circumstances and bearing in mind the security interests of the U.S.S.R. But the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. believes that the initiative in ending nuclear weapons tests displayed by the Soviet Union will be supported by corresponding steps of Great Britain and the United States.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. voices the hope that this Address will meet with a sympathetic response and support on the part of the Parliament of Great Britain where the public at large and influential political circles favour the immediate stopping of nuclear tests. The Soviet Union fully understands the concern expressed by them in view of the great danger for the British Isles involved in the continued race in nuclear arms and the experimental explosions of atomic and thermonuclear weapons.

Aware of the great responsibility of parliaments to the peoples for the great cause of maintaining and strengthening peace, the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addresses an insistent appeal to the Parliament of Great Britain to wield all its influence so that the question of ending the tests of atomic and thermonuclear weapons by all states for all time, at long last, be finally settled, in conformity with the aspirations of all mankind.

**ADDRESS**  
**OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE U.S.S.R.**  
**TO THE BUNDESTAG**  
**OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY**

Adopted on March 31, 1958

*(Gazette of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.,  
No. 7, 1958)*

The Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics deems it necessary to inform the Bundestag of the Federal Republic of Germany about its attitude to the steps taken by the Federal Republic to equip the country with atomic weapons.

On March 25, 1958, a resolution was adopted in the Bundestag of the Federal Republic by votes of the deputies belonging to parties of the government coalition, empowering the Federal Government to equip the West German armed forces with atomic and missile weapons. Shortly before this, the Government of the F.R.G. reached agreement with the U.S. Government on the purchase of a consignment of American missiles adapted to carrying nuclear warheads.

Thus, the Federal Government and the Bundestag groups of the coalition parties supporting it decided to push the country on to the path of preparing for atomic war, and the Federal Republic is now on the eve of undertaking practical measures in this respect. Today already no one can have any doubt that the previous evasive statements of the Government of the F.R.G. on this question were designed to mislead the population of West Germany and international public opinion and that in reality it was only waiting for an opportune moment to confront them with a *fait accompli*.

The Soviet Union cannot ignore the fact that the state, which the peoples of most European countries have special reasons for being wary of, is now the first among the continental European NATO countries to adopt atomic weapons for its armed forces. The Government of the F.R.G. is

setting off a race in atomic weapons with the participation of an ever wider range of states, which cannot be assessed otherwise than a direct challenge to all who sincerely want to strengthen peace in Europe and lessen the danger of a nuclear-missile war.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. considers it necessary to declare that implementation of the decision to equip the armies of the Federal Republic of Germany with atomic and missile weapons and also the contemplated consent to the establishment of foreign atomic and missile bases in the territory of West Germany, will create in Europe a situation in many respects similar to the one when Hitler Germany began to prepare for the Second World War. But one must not forget that it resulted in the gravest catastrophe in Germany's history. In our days attempts of the Federal Republic of Germany to embark again on the road of military gambles would all the more be tantamount to national suicide.

The Soviet people, whose constructive powers are concentrated on carrying out gigantic economic and cultural development plans, on further raising their living standard, want to live in peace with the peoples of all countries, the Federal Republic of Germany included. But the Soviet people naturally cannot watch with indifference how a seat of the war danger is again arising near their western frontiers, in the part of Europe whence war swooped down on our Homeland twice within the lifetime of one generation, and they will be forced to draw from this the necessary conclusions.

Attempts by the advocates of arming West Germany with atomic and missile weapons to frighten the population of the Federal Republic of Germany with a threat on the part of the Soviet Union and communism, are very familiar. People in Germany cannot but remember that the preparations for aggressive war by Hitler were also conducted under the flag of struggle against the "communist menace". The Soviet Union wants to believe that the population of West Germany, in the first place the generation which lived through the tragedy of the late war, will not let itself be deceived once again by such fabrications, which fostered the nazi crimes in the recent past.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. cannot overlook the fact that the decision to arm the Bundeswehr with atomic



and missile weapons was taken at the time when preparations were started in earnest for a Summit meeting with the object of easing international tension, reducing armaments and lessening the danger of an annihilating atomic war. Attempts are made hastily to draw the Federal Republic of Germany into the vortex of atomic armament with the obvious intention of carrying out these military measures before a Summit meeting and preventing it from being successful. Thereby West Germany again finds itself in one rank with the most rabid foes of a *détente* and a peaceful settlement of pressing international issues.

The decision to arm the Bundeswehr with atomic and missile weapons is accompanied by assurances of a striving for general controlled disarmament. These assurances, however, cannot inspire any confidence, because they are irreconcilably contradicted by the practical steps to arm the country with atomic and missile weapons which are being taken in the Federal Republic of Germany. If today the Federal Government is taking a decision to equip the Bundeswehr with missile and atomic weapons, if it is importing American missiles from the United States—all this is certainly not being done in order to abandon these measures tomorrow. This is also being done evidently with the object, even prior to the Summit meeting, of erecting fresh barriers to agreement on the proposal of the Polish People's Republic, supported by the peace-loving nations, for the establishment of an atom-free zone in Central Europe, of blocking in advance the road to West Germany's participation in such a zone.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. draws the attention of the Bundestag to the fact that the Soviet Government has expressed readiness to assume a solemn obligation to respect the status of an atom-free zone and to regard the territories of the states within it, namely, the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, Poland and Czechoslovakia, as excluded from the sphere of use of nuclear and missile weapons. If the policy of arming the Federal Republic of Germany with atomic weapons is carried out this will inevitably place West Germany in such a position that in the event of a military conflict its territory would be swept by the hurricane of a nuclear-missile war leaving a lifeless desert in its wake.

The feelings agitating millions upon millions of Germans worried over the fate of the German nation because of the atomic war preparations in West Germany, are close and understandable to the Soviet people. The protest movement which developed in West Germany in recent weeks, whose very name speaks for itself, the Movement Against Atomic Death, is regarded by Soviet people as a manifestation of the German people's deep concern for their future. The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. shares the hope of those Germans who believe that common sense and the experience of the German people will keep the Federal Republic of Germany from taking reckless, fatal steps.

The atomic arming of West Germany would shut tightly the only avenue to restoring the German people's national unity which still remains open, namely, through rapprochement and agreement between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany.

The enemies of German unity do not shrink from casting overboard the vital interests of the German people to suit the military plans of NATO, to be more exact, of the one power which plays the dominating role in this military grouping.

This is also attested to by the refusal of the Government of the F.R.G. to support the proposal for examining at a meeting of heads of government the question of a peace treaty with Germany, for the conclusion of which, as could be expected, any German government should strive.

The Bundestag knows that the Soviet Union has repeatedly expressed readiness to assist both German states in the exploration of joint ways for restoring the national and state unity of Germany. But what real possibilities will the Soviet Union have for rendering such assistance in future if the decision to arm the Bundeswehr with nuclear weapons is implemented, if West German territory is made available for atomic and rocket installations of other NATO powers?

While in West Germany the traces of the late war are far from obliterated and each German family remembers its kith and kin who perished or were maimed, in the highest legislative body of the country calls again resound: "Armaments, armaments, armaments!" Soviet men and women

refuse to believe that the German people want to embark on this disastrous path.

The atomic arming of West Germany, which is being undertaken contrary to the unanimous demand of the peoples to save mankind from the threat of a nuclear war, shows how far the forces inimical to peace and international co-operation would want to go. But the Soviet Union will not swerve from the path of consistent and steadfast struggle to prevent the danger of atomic war. At the sitting which adopted the present Address to the Bundestag the Supreme Soviet resolved to discontinue unilaterally all atomic and thermonuclear weapons tests by the Soviet Union.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. considers it its duty to communicate to the Bundestag its views on the measures for equipping West Germany with atomic weapons, inasmuch as the Soviet Union is one of the four Great Powers which, until a German peace treaty is concluded, bear special responsibility for seeing that Germany should not threaten her neighbours or world peace. The Supreme Soviet wants to do everything within its power so that the deputies of the highest legislative body in the Federal Republic of Germany should know the truth about the dangers which would follow from the implementation of measures for equipping West Germany with atomic weapons and could with full responsibility weigh the attendant consequences.

In sending the present Address, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. is guided by a desire to pool the efforts of the Soviet and the German peoples in reinforcing the peace. Were the enemies of peace to succeed in setting the Soviet and German peoples at loggerheads, this would be an irreparable misfortune not only for the peoples of our countries, but also for the other peoples of the world.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. voices confidence that at this crucial moment the forces which will not allow the Federal Republic of Germany to be impelled on to a fatal road gain the upper hand in West Germany. The interests of universal peace, the security interests of the European peoples, including the peace and welfare of the German people themselves, imperatively demand that the Federal Republic of Germany reject the attempts to draw it into highly dangerous gambles and that it pursue a peace policy, a policy of friendship and co-operation with all the nations.

ADDRESS  
OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE U.S.S.R.  
TO THE PARLIAMENTS OF ALL COUNTRIES  
OF THE WORLD  
ON ENDING NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS

Adopted on March 31, 1958

*(Gazette of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.,  
No. 7, 1958)*

The Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addresses the parliaments of all countries on the question of the unconditional and prompt ending of nuclear weapons tests. Continuation of experimental explosions of atomic and thermonuclear weapons arouses deep concern and anxiety among the peoples of all the countries and affects the vital interests of all men and women whatever continent they live in.

On May 10, 1957, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. addressed the parliaments of states possessing nuclear weapons—the Congress of the United States of America and the Parliament of Great Britain—and proposed that concerted measures designed to end the testing of these weapons be adopted. On December 21, 1957, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. adopted a resolution proposing that the U.S.S.R., the United States and Great Britain undertake to stop all tests of atomic and thermonuclear weapons as of January 1, 1958.

Unfortunately, owing to the stand taken by the United States and Great Britain, so far the question of ending nuclear tests has not been settled. Experimental explosions of A- and H-bombs continue. More than that, the contest in creating ever more lethal weapons of mass destruction is developing with growing intensity.

Experimental explosions of atomic and thermonuclear weapons are exerting a pernicious influence, endangering even in peace time the health of the present and future gen-

erations. Numerous public leaders and thousands of outstanding scientists of many countries demand with increasing insistence the immediate cessation of atomic and thermonuclear weapons tests. Authoritative scientists draw attention to the fact that a solution of this problem brooks no delay, because the accumulation of radioactive fallout as a result of nuclear explosions can inflict irreparable harm on mankind.

An early settlement of the question of ending nuclear tests is also dictated by the consideration that at present this can be done with relative ease, because so far only three states possess atomic and thermonuclear weapons.

Guided by a desire actually to initiate the universal discontinuation of nuclear weapons tests and thereby make the first step towards the final deliverance of mankind from the threat of a devastating atomic war, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. has adopted a decision on the unilateral discontinuation of atomic and thermonuclear weapons tests by the Soviet Union.

Aware of the great responsibility of parliaments to the peoples for the great cause of maintaining and strengthening peace, the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has addressed an insistent appeal to the Congress of the United States of America and the Parliament of Great Britain, as the parliaments of states producing nuclear weapons, to wield all their influence so that the question of ending the tests of atomic and thermonuclear weapons by all states for all time, at long last, be finally settled.

The Supreme Soviet urges the parliaments of other countries to support this initiative which meets the aspirations of millions upon millions of people in all countries.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. is deeply convinced that the prompt cessation of atomic and thermonuclear weapons tests by all states possessing such arms would meet the interests of all the countries, both big and small, regardless of whether they possess atomic weapons or not. The pernicious effect of nuclear explosions recognises neither geographical boundaries nor political distinctions between states. Hence every state must determine its attitude to the ending of these tests. Naturally, primary responsibility for the settlement of this question rests with the powers which have nuclear weapons and are testing them. But this

does not at all mean that the other countries are incapable of making a contribution to this important matter. Each state, whether a Great Power or a small country, member or non-member of the United Nations, can render great help in reaching agreement on the discontinuation of nuclear weapons tests by supporting the demand of all the peoples for the immediate cessation of the dangerous experiments with A- and H-bombs.

If the other states possessing nuclear weapons follow the example of the Soviet Union and, for their part, stop the testing of such weapons, the question of the universal discontinuation of the tests of atomic and thermonuclear weapons for all time will be settled. Thereby a big step will be made towards ending the race in atomic armaments and consolidating the security of all the peoples. This undoubtedly will be of great importance for normalising the international climate and will contribute to the solution of many other outstanding international problems.

It goes without saying that if the United States and Great Britain do not want to respond to this humane decision of the Soviet Union and prefer, as hitherto, to continue experimental explosions of atomic and thermonuclear weapons, the Soviet Government will be free to act in the matter of nuclear weapons tests by the Soviet Union in conformity with the above circumstances and bearing in mind the security interests of the U.S.S.R. But the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. believes that the initiative in ending nuclear weapons tests displayed by the Soviet Union will be supported by corresponding steps of the United States and Great Britain.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. urges the parliaments of all the countries to render every support to the efforts aimed at the universal and final ending of nuclear weapons tests, in conformity with the aspirations of the people, the aspirations of all mankind.

RESOLUTION  
OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE U.S.S.R.  
COMMISSIONING THE CHAIRMEN OF THE CHAMBERS  
TO ADDRESS A MESSAGE  
TO THE PARLIAMENTS OF MEMBER STATES  
OF THE ANTI-HITLER COALITION  
AND THE COUNTRIES WHICH SUFFERED  
FROM NAZI AGGRESSION  
DURING THE SECOND WORLD WAR

Adopted on March 31, 1958

*(Gazette of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.,  
No. 7, 1958)*

The Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics hereby *resolves*:

To instruct the Chairmen of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities, on behalf of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., to address a message to the parliaments of member states of the anti-Hitler coalition and countries which suffered from nazi aggression during the Second World War to join efforts with the object of preventing the arming of the Federal Republic of Germany with atomic and missile weapons.

RESOLUTION  
OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE U.S.S.R.  
ON THE CESSATION OF ATOMIC  
AND THERMONUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS  
AND ON THE BERLIN QUESTION

Adopted on December 25, 1958

*(Gazette of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.,  
No. 1, 1959)*

I

Having heard the report of the Government of the U.S.S.R. in reply to a question by a group of Deputies on the cessation of atomic and thermonuclear weapons tests, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. notes that the decision taken by the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. on the unilateral cessation of all atomic and hydrogen weapons tests by the Soviet Union as from March 31, 1958, was welcomed with great satisfaction by the peoples of all countries. This historic and deeply humane decision is rightly regarded as a major step towards the consolidation of world peace and the complete deliverance of mankind from the dreadful threat of nuclear war.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. notes with anxiety that despite the legitimate and steadily growing demand of the peoples, the United States of America and Great Britain continue to refuse to agree to an immediate and universal cessation of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests for all time to come. More than that, after March 31 they started their largest ever series of nuclear tests in an effort to win unilateral military superiority over the Soviet Union. This was what compelled the U.S.S.R., in the interests of its own security which is inseparable from world peace, to renew nuclear tests. The Soviet Union, however, is still prepared to renounce further tests providing the U.S.A. and Great Britain are prepared to sign an agreement on the cessation

of all forms of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests in perpetuity with the establishment of effective international control over the observance of such an agreement.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. considers that at present there is all the more no reason for further holding up the signing of an agreement on banning nuclear weapons tests in view of the fact that the Geneva conference of experts, consisting of the world's most prominent nuclear scientists, unanimously confirmed that effective international control over the implementation of such an agreement was fully possible.

In connection with the present Geneva talks on the banning of nuclear weapons tests, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. cannot but note that the U.S.A. and Great Britain have still not evinced their preparedness to sign an agreement on a universal cessation of atomic and nuclear weapons tests for all time.

The peoples of all countries of the world are insistently and emphatically demanding that the powers possessing atomic and hydrogen weapons outlaw the testing of these weapons of mass destruction, and these demands will continue to grow daily until the production of the increasingly destructive types of atomic and nuclear bombs is stopped and an end is put to the ever growing harmful effect of atomic fallout on people's health.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. expresses the hope that the states bearing the responsibility for the continuation of experimental explosions of nuclear devices will take all the necessary steps to reach agreement on this question, which is worrying the whole of mankind and affects the security and well-being not only of the present but also of future generations.

As regards the Soviet Union, it shall persevere in its efforts to have this important question solved in the nearest future.

Considering that the banning of tests of all types of atomic and hydrogen weapons would be an important step towards ending the arms race and the "cold war", towards consolidating peace among nations, the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics *resolves*:

1. To approve the policy and practical measures taken by the Government of the U.S.S.R. on the question of ceasing atomic and hydrogen weapons tests.

2. To instruct the Government of the U.S.S.R. to persevere in its efforts to achieve an immediate, universal and unconditional cessation of nuclear weapons tests for all time to come.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. expresses the hope that for their part the U.S.A. and Great Britain will make the necessary effort to attain this great and noble goal, which conforms with the aspirations of all nations.

## II

Having heard the reply of the Government of the U.S.S.R. to a question by a group of Deputies with regard to the Berlin problem, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. notes with satisfaction the initiative taken by the Government of the U.S.S.R. by proposing the conversion of West Berlin into a demilitarised free city.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. notes that the Governments of the Western Powers, who have long ago renounced the main provisions of the Allied treaties and agreements on a joint policy with regard to Germany after the war, have no right or justification whatever for imposing a military occupation regime upon the population of West Berlin.

By taking advantage of the presence of their troops in West Berlin for activity aimed against the Soviet Union and its allies, the Western Powers are aggravating relations between states and thereby creating a grave threat to peace and security in Europe.

The proposals of the Government of the U.S.S.R. on the Berlin question have the purpose of relaxing international tension, putting an end to the state of "cold war" and clearing the road for the restoration of good relations between the Soviet Union, the United States of America, Great Britain and France.

With deep satisfaction the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. notes that the proposals of the Soviet Union on the Berlin question have been warmly supported and approved by the German Democratic Republic, in whose territory Berlin is situated, and also by the peoples and governments of a number of other states, which understand that being occu-

ped by the NATO powers West Berlin has become a point where a conflict fraught with grave consequences to world peace may arise at any moment. The settlement of the Berlin question and the creation thereby of normal conditions in West Berlin would greatly facilitate the settlement of the question of European security and other urgent international problems.

In view of the fact that the ending of the occupation regime and the conversion of West Berlin into a free city would greatly help to relax tension in Europe and reduce the danger of another war breaking out, the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics *resolves*:

To approve the policy and practical steps of the Government of the U.S.S.R. in the Berlin question.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. calls upon the U.S.A., Great Britain and France to make their contribution towards the settlement of the Berlin question in accordance with the interests of strengthening peace in Europe and the whole world.

## REPORT

by Deputy N. S. KHRUSHCHOV,  
Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.,  
First Secretary of the C.C. C.P.S.U.,

“On the International Situation  
and the Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union”  
Delivered at the Third Session  
of the Fifth Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.

on October 31, 1959

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

The Soviet Government, guided by the Leninist policy of peace, the decisions of the 20th and 21st Party congresses and the directives of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., has been consistently and resolutely pursuing a policy of easing international tension, ending the “cold war” and improving relations between countries in the interests of a durable peace and international security.

We note with satisfaction that the recent period has been marked by a distinct improvement in the international situation thanks to the efforts of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and of all the peace-loving forces. The important thing is that international tension has considerably eased and the outlook for a durable world peace has become more favourable. Yet only recently the passions aroused by the “cold war” had run so high that even a small spark could have touched off a world-wide conflagration. Certain Western Powers based their foreign policy on frankly aggressive calculations, on “positions of strength”. Those who inspired that policy wanted to impose their will on the peace-loving peoples, and to secure solutions to international problems with the aid of the big stick.

Sometimes this approach to international affairs was termed a "liberation policy" and sometimes a "roll-back" policy or a "policy of edging out", but its essence never changed. For to "liberate" from something those who neither ask for nor want that sort of "liberation" means to impose one's own system on others by force. No people has ever asked, nor will ever ask, to be "liberated" by the capitalist gentlemen from the socialist system, whose advantages and benefits it has already come to know, and to be returned to the system of capitalist exploitation.

No people which has won freedom from capitalist exploitation has ever expressed the desire to be "liberated" from the factories and mills, from the right to use the riches of its country in its own way, or from the right to shape its way of life as it chooses. No free people has ever wanted to be controlled by a handful of those who rob it and appropriate the fruits of its labour. But it seems that those who in a number of countries still live by exploiting the people refuse to understand this.

When these people talked about "edging out" or "rolling back", they did not mean that someone should be asked politely to move up and make room. What they meant was direct military intervention in the affairs of the socialist and other peace-loving countries. Hence the policy of a continuous arms race, illusory plans for achieving "nuclear superiority", and so on. This found expression, among other things, in the vocabulary of the advocates of that policy, who spoke of a "brink of war" policy, "massive retaliation", etc. There were even outright threats of "preventive" war against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

Now times have changed. The futility of the "positions of strength" policy is realised even by some of its more active proponents. Only the most bellicose Western leaders seem unable to break away from the old formulas. Echoes of the past can still be heard here and there. Take the decision of unhappy memory, adopted by the U.S. Congress, to hold a so-called Captive Nations Week and to offer up prayers for their liberation. The terms used on this occasion were not "roll back", but the meaning was the same—it was the same sort of appeal to interfere in other peoples' affairs.

As you see, things have moved from the "roll-back" policy to the offering up of prayers to the Lord. But what can that lead to? If Western leaders go on praying to God to "liberate" the peoples of the socialist countries and if we, for our part, begin praying to God that he may liberate their peoples from capitalist domination, we shall put the Lord in a difficult position (*animation*), because what is he to do in the circumstances? Obviously, if he sides with the majority and takes a democratic stand, the decision will be in our favour, in favour of socialism. (*Animation. Applause.*) But this is somewhat aside, as it were, from the substance of my report.

A more sober appraisal of the situation, and a more sensible understanding of the alignment of forces that has taken shape in the international arena, is now beginning to gain the upper hand in the West. And that understanding necessarily leads to the conclusion that plans for the use of military force against the socialist world must be scrapped. Reality itself demands that countries with different social systems should know how to live together on our planet, to coexist peacefully.

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

The main reason is the growing strength and international influence of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the world socialist system. It is fortunate for mankind that in our time, a time of great scientific discoveries and technological achievements, there has arisen a rapidly developing socialist system, a system which by its very nature strives for peace. The faster the strength of the socialist countries increases, the greater the opportunities of preserving and strengthening peace.

At the same time the countries which have shaken off colonial dependence, and also other countries vitally concerned with maintaining peace and averting new wars, are playing an increasing role on the world scene. It is today impossible to ignore the voice of these countries, which are situated on all continents.

In the capitalist countries, too, peace-loving forces calling for an end to the "cold war" and advocating peaceful co-operation between countries have recently begun to exert a growing influence.

Lastly, it is being realised by increasingly wide circles, including many statesmen in the capitalist countries, that now that there are nuclear and rocket weapons, war threatens unprecedented loss of life and destruction, primarily to the countries that would dare to launch a new world war.

#### PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE IS AN IMPERATIVE DEMAND OF LIFE

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have by their peace policy opened mankind's road to the development of society without wars, on the basis of peaceful co-operation.

Today the peoples of the whole world are realising more and more the outstanding importance of the wise idea of peaceful coexistence put forward by the great Lenin.

In view of the present alignment of forces in the world arena and of the level reached by military technique, no one except those who have lost their sense of reality can suggest any other way of promoting relations between countries with different social systems than peaceful coexistence.

Western leaders often indulge in talk of whether they should "accept" or "reject" the proposal for peaceful coexistence put forward by the Soviet Union. This sort of talk, in my view, shows an inability to grasp the essence of the problem. The point is that today peaceful coexistence is an indisputable fact and not someone's request or suggestion. It is an objective necessity stemming from the present world situation and the present stage of the development of human society. The two main social systems now existing on earth possess arms whose use would lead to disastrous consequences. Whoever today declares that he does not recognise peaceful coexistence, and argues against it, in fact advocates war.

The point at issue now is not whether or not there should be peaceful coexistence, for peaceful coexistence is there, and will be there if we want to avoid the lunacy of world nuclear and rocket war. The point is to coexist on a reasonable basis. It can hardly be considered reasonable that

countries have to live in conditions in which, despite the absence of war, guns and missiles are constantly at the ready and military aircraft carrying atom and hydrogen bombs are kept in the air all the time. And those aircraft not only fly—they sometimes crash with their deadly cargo as a result of various accidents. There have been several accidents of this kind in the United States. The very fact that such mishaps occur indicates how dangerous it is to stockpile and play with such weapons.

The Soviet Government and the entire Soviet people proceed from Lenin's thesis regarding the coexistence of states with different social systems, and are doing everything in their power to ensure a durable peace on earth. It is essential that people should not think as they go to bed that it may be their last peaceful night, that a military catastrophe may break out at any moment. We want peaceful coexistence on a reasonable basis; we want government agencies and public bodies to work towards this end, and want conditions to be provided for international co-operation. That co-operation should be based on the principle that every country chooses for itself or borrows from its neighbour what it thinks fit, without any outside imposition. This is the only condition on which coexistence can be genuinely peaceful and good-neighbourly.

Such coexistence of countries with different social systems naturally presupposes reciprocal concessions in the interests of peace. It is fair to say that here we need a realistic approach, a sober assessment of the actual state of affairs, and mutual understanding and consideration of each other's interests. This is a principled, and at the same time a flexible, attitude in the struggle to preserve peace.

Coexistence on a reasonable basis presupposes the recognition of the existence of different systems, the recognition of the right of every people independently to deal with all political and social problems of its country, respect for sovereignty and adherence to the principle of non-interference in internal affairs, and the settlement of all international issues by negotiation.

The principles of peaceful coexistence were well formulated at the Bandung Conference, and were later also approved by the United Nations. Speaking plainly, under



peaceful coexistence the countries concerned must meet each other half-way in the interests of peace.

In itself, the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems presupposes elements of reciprocal concessions, and mutual consideration of interests, because there is no other way of building up normal relations between countries.

In ideological matters, we have stood, and shall always stand firm as a rock, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. Ideological issues cannot be settled by force; you cannot impose the ideology prevailing in one country upon another country. No sensible person has ever conceded that ideological disputes, or questions of the political structure of a particular country, must be settled by war.

The capitalists disapprove of the socialist social system; our ideology and world outlook are alien to them. Similarly, we citizens of the socialist states disapprove of the capitalist system and bourgeois ideology. But we have to live in peace, settling the international disputes that arise solely by peaceful means. Hence the need for reciprocal concessions.

It goes without saying that neither of the two sides will make concessions on the fundamental social and ideological issues which divide them. The concessions I mean are of a different kind. For example, the Soviet Union is visited by representatives of the capitalist countries, who state their views when speaking in public in our country. We do not agree with them in all cases or on all points, but we take a tolerant attitude to their utterances. When we go to a capitalist country, we, too, speak in public there, frankly stating our views, and it seems that there, too, people adopt a tolerant attitude.

The principle of peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems implies non-interference in internal affairs, reciprocal concessions and compromises or, if you will, mutual adaptation in the sphere of inter-state relations as regards the settlement of urgent practical issues in order to preserve and strengthen peace. Lenin stressed that both before and after winning state power the working class must know how to carry out a flexible policy, to compromise and to come to terms when reality and the interests of the cause demand it.

What does that mean under present-day conditions? Let us take the disarmament problem as an example. The Soviet Government has submitted a proposal for general and complete disarmament. We believe that its implementation will assure peace for all peoples. But we are also willing to consider other proposals in order to achieve mutually acceptable solutions of the disarmament problem. This is a concrete example of our readiness to make concessions when it is still impossible to solve the problem as a whole, that is, impossible to do what we think best.

The capitalist countries also make certain concessions. Everyone knows, for example, that they recognised our Soviet state and then most of the other socialist countries, even though the ruling capitalist circles are opposed to socialism. They have diplomatic relations with socialist countries and negotiate with them; together with them, they are members of the United Nations and discuss international issues within that organisation. Of course, these too are concessions or, if you will, adaptation on the part of the capitalist countries, which are compelled to reckon with the indisputable fact of the existence and development of the countries of the world socialist system.

When we speak of the peaceful coexistence of the socialist and capitalist countries, our idea is that neither should interfere in the other's internal affairs. It is only on this reasonable basis that peaceful coexistence is possible.

In the actual relations between countries with different social systems there arise, and will continue to arise, many issues on which they should meet each other half-way, seeking agreement on a mutually acceptable basis in order to prevent tension, and use every opportunity, no matter how slight, to avert a new war.

But reciprocal concessions for the benefit of the peaceful coexistence of countries must not be confused with concessions on principles, on what affects the very nature of our socialist system and our ideology. There can be no question of any concessions or adaptation in this respect. Any concessions on matters of principle, on ideological points, would mean shifting to the standpoint of our opponents. They would amount to a qualitative change of policy and would constitute a betrayal of the cause of the working class. Whoever took that path would betray the so-

cialist cause and should, of course, be criticised without mercy.

We are convinced of the force of our truth, and we raise on high and show this socialist truth, and the advantages of socialism, to the whole world. We need not fear that the peoples of the socialist countries will be tempted by the capitalist devil and will renounce socialism. To take any other view would imply lack of faith in the strength of socialism, in the power of the working class and in its creative abilities.

The history of the Soviet state contains many examples of Lenin's wise and flexible foreign policy aimed at solving key problems of peace. The Brest-Litovsk Peace was one example. Vladimir Ilyich Lenin called for peace with Germany to enable the young Soviet state to build socialism in peace. Lenin and the Party had to wage a stubborn struggle against Trotsky, who at that time raised Leftist objections and put forward his notorious slogan, "Neither peace, nor war," thereby playing into the hands of the German imperialists. It is well known that Trotsky's adventurist policy was used by the German imperialists against the Soviet Republic. The young socialist state had to overcome great difficulties. Such were the fruits of political adventurism.

The situation is, of course, entirely different today. We have cited this historical example to show Lenin's fidelity to principle in foreign policy and his flexibility in carrying it out.

Some bourgeois leaders who are opposed to peaceful coexistence try to accuse the socialist countries, above all the Soviet Union, of insincerity in speaking of peaceful coexistence. They allege that we put forward the slogan of peaceful coexistence only temporarily, for tactical reasons, because, they say, Marxism-Leninism in fact bases itself upon the thesis of the necessity of war to secure the victory of socialism.

But these allegations are sheer distortion of the meaning of Marxism-Leninism. Marxism has always waged an uncompromising struggle against militarism. It has never regarded war between countries as indispensable for the victory of the working class. It was the Russian Bolsheviks, led by Lenin, who waged the most uncompro-

missing and consistent struggle against annexationist wars. Remember also the outstanding leaders of the working-class movement August Bebel, Jean Jaurès and Karl Liebknecht, who fought vigorously against militarism and war. Jaurès paid with his life for his unflagging struggle against the imperialist war of 1914. We Communists know that the working class, the working peasantry and working people in general are the ones who have to pay for war with their blood, while the capitalists wax fat on wars. But we Communists said that since the antagonisms of capitalism had caused a predatory war for the redivision of the world, the working class and the people as a whole could not remain passive. The First World War was an imperialist war for the redivision of the world. The working class had, as Leninism teaches us, to use that war in its own interests, turn the imperialist war into a civil war, assume power and establish a state in which the working class, the working people as a whole, would be the master, and then stop the war and strive to make all annexationist wars impossible.

The whole world is familiar with the brilliant way in which these Leninist principles were applied by the Bolshevik Party during the First World War. It was the Bolsheviks who, immediately after the establishment of the Soviet state, called on all belligerents to end the war and conclude peace. The Second World War was likewise begun by imperialist countries intent on seizing foreign territory and redividing the world. Great changes occurred in the world after the defeat of Hitler Germany, fascist Italy and militarist Japan. Many European and Asian countries broke away from the capitalist system and established the system of people's democracy, a socialist system.

As we see, historical experience shows that it was the imperialists and not the Communists who unleashed wars.

When we speak of peaceful coexistence, we do so in good faith, because peaceful coexistence is an unshakable principle of the foreign policy of the Soviet state. As regards the social system of any country, it is an internal affair of its people. We strictly adhere to the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

The policy of the peaceful coexistence of countries, invariably pursued by the Soviet Union and the other

socialist countries, is winning greater understanding in the West. Forms of relations between East and West that the Soviet Government has long championed, such as negotiations on urgent international problems, reciprocal visits by statesmen, mutually beneficial economic ties, or scientific and cultural contacts, are gaining ground.

And, of course, the easing in international relations which is setting in as all can now see, is largely due to the efforts of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

During the last 18 months alone, that is, during the time that the present Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. has been in office, the Soviet Government has put forward important proposals, such as those for discontinuing nuclear weapons tests, setting up atom-free zones, eliminating the survivals of the Second World War through a peace treaty with Germany, convening a conference of heads of government to discuss the more pressing international issues, and effecting general and complete disarmament.

The efforts of the Soviet Government have already produced some positive results. To cite an example, negotiations are now being conducted with a view to reaching agreement on the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests. These negotiations are, it is true, going very slowly, but a certain progress has nevertheless been made and it is to be hoped that they will be successfully completed before long. You will recall that a conference of Foreign Ministers was convened in Geneva to discuss the elimination of the survivals of the Second World War and that, while it did not result in a solution of the problems on the agenda, was nevertheless helpful in clarifying, and bringing closer together, the views of the parties and all in all played a positive role.

The Soviet Government has taken a number of steps to improve relations with the major Western Powers—the United States, Britain and France. The trips which this year were made to the United States by Comrades A. I. Mikoyan and F. R. Kozlov, the subsequent visit of Mr. Nixon, the U.S. Vice-President, to the Soviet Union and the exchange of exhibitions—the Soviet exhibition in New York and the American exhibition in Moscow—made for better Soviet-American relations. The ice of the “cold war” showed the first cracks.

The exchange of views with Mr. Harold Macmillan, the British Prime Minister, during his visit to the U.S.S.R. played a notable part in improving Anglo-Soviet relations and in bringing about a healthier international atmosphere.

The agreement on an exchange of visits by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. President was a particularly important and far-reaching step towards a radical improvement in Soviet-American relations and a general relaxation of international tension.

During my U.S. visit I met and talked with President Dwight Eisenhower and other statesmen, with representatives of the most varied groups and with ordinary people of America. Those meetings and talks convinced me that the overwhelming majority of the American people are against war and want better relations between our countries. Many prominent U.S. leaders, headed by the President, appreciate this sentiment of the American people; they are concerned about the situation created by the arms race and the “cold war”, and want to find ways of promoting peace.

We, for our part, did our best to bring it home both to the spokesmen for various American groups whom we had a chance to meet in person and to the American people as a whole that the Soviet Government and the entire Soviet people sincerely want peace and are striving for better relations between the U.S.S.R. and the United States. We seem to have succeeded in this to some extent, for there is now a better understanding of the Soviet attitude in the United States.

You know that during my conversations with President Eisenhower we exchanged views on a number of major international issues, such as general disarmament, a German peace treaty, the Berlin question and so on, as well as the question of promoting Soviet-American relations. The results of the exchange were set out in the Joint Soviet-American Communiqué. I wish only to add that our talks were very useful and contributed, as we see it, to a measure of mutual understanding and rapprochement regarding the appraisal of the present situation as a whole, the approach to certain specific issues of importance, and the awareness of the need for an improvement in Soviet-American

ican relations. That is a substantial contribution to a durable universal peace and we value it greatly.

You will recall that agreement was recently reached on a meeting between General de Gaulle, the President of the French Republic, and myself. We believe that that meeting will be useful in developing Soviet-French relations and promoting world peace.

Taken as a whole, our relations with France are shaping normally, although her participation in military blocs directed against us has its effect upon her policy.

Objectively, the interests of our two countries do not clash anywhere and, of course, it was not mere chance that we were allies in both world wars. To be sure, the attitude of our countries to certain issues is affected by a difference in appraisal of the present situation. But that difference does not appear to be basic, and is perfectly capable of being eliminated. The Soviet people would like to live in peace and friendship with the French people; they wish France prosperity and greatness. Looking into the future, I see no snags or obstacles that could seriously hamper good, friendly relations between our country and the French Republic.

From the lofty rostrum of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., I should like to declare that we value highly the realistic statements made by President de Gaulle and Premier Debré on the inviolability of the Oder-Neisse boundary. That will undoubtedly contribute to the promotion of European peace.

It stands to reason that the Soviet people, like all peace-loving peoples the world over, are perturbed by the war which has been going on in Algeria for five years. President de Gaulle's recent proposals for solving the Algerian problem on the basis of self-determination by means of a plebiscite in Algeria can play an important part in settling this question. They will play such a role if they do not remain merely declarative and if they are supported with real steps which, taking account of the right of the Algerian population to free and independent development, at the same time ensure co-ordination of the interests of both parties.

It is well known that there exist close historical ties between France and Algeria. If these relations are sub-

sequently built on a new, mutually acceptable basis ensuring real adherence to the principle of voluntariness and equality, this can no doubt help establish peace in the area. Past years have shown that attempts to settle this kind of issue against the popular will, by means of force, are utterly hopeless, and we should be glad if the realisation of this fact gained the upper hand in France with regard to Algeria. The Soviet Union has never concealed the fact that it is sympathetic to the peoples who are fighting against colonialism, for their independence and national freedom. It will readily be seen that a peaceful settlement of the Algerian question would contribute to the international prestige of France and enhance her role as a Great Power.

#### THE WAY TO A FURTHER IMPROVEMENT IN THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION LIES THROUGH THE SETTLEMENT OF OUTSTANDING ISSUES

Comrade Deputies, we have succeeded in achieving a certain improvement in the international atmosphere as a whole and in paving the way to negotiations on specific measures to clear away the impediments accumulated in international relations by the "cold war". We are now entering the phase of such negotiations.

This does not imply, of course, that all difficulties in international relations, or at least in Soviet-American relations, have been removed. It should be obvious that the impediments of many years cannot be removed overnight. No such miracle is possible. A great deal has still to be done in order to melt the ice of the "cold war" properly and achieve a considerable improvement in international relations.

Nevertheless, the needle of the international barometer is visibly moving—not so fast as we should like, it is true—from "storm" and "rain" to "fair".

We must not forget, however, that unlike the four seasons, which succeed each other naturally, the international weather does not change of itself. To achieve lasting clear weather in international relations, vigorous efforts for peace must be systematically made by all governments,

but most of all by the peoples, who must induce their governments to work for peace. The peoples have a vital interest in easing international tension and strengthening peace on earth. Hence it is essential that they should know well how the international situation is shaping, so that they can prevail on their governments to pursue a peaceful policy.

What specifically does this mean? First and foremost, it means that the disarmament problems must at last be solved and the arms race stopped. If we want to ensure a durable peace, we can no longer tolerate, in international relations, the knots that are a legacy of the Second World War and of the "cold war" period which followed. These knots must be untangled and untied.

In this connection, we must bear in mind the need to solve a problem that has long been awaiting solution, namely, the conclusion of a German peace treaty. The serious contradictions over Germany which exist between the one-time allies of the anti-Hitler coalition, resurgent militarism and revanchist trends in West Germany, and the tense relations between the two German states all make the situation in Europe unstable and fraught with danger. All these problems would to an appreciable degree be solved by a peace treaty with the two German states which actually exist, and the Berlin question, too, would thus be settled.

The Soviet stand on the German question has been stated on more than one occasion and I need not speak about it at length. I also stated our attitude during my conversations with President Eisenhower, and as everyone knows, we agreed that it was desirable to resume negotiations on the German question.

It must be said that, as a whole, the situation in Europe still gives rise to serious concern. Large armed forces of both sides are concentrated in the area, and they are in direct contact with each other. There are numerous foreign air and naval bases in Western Europe; in addition, rocket and nuclear bases are being set up there. Despite protests from world opinion, and contrary to the interests of peace, the Bundeswehr is being equipped with nuclear and rocket weapons. We must therefore not for one moment forget the danger of a new military explosion.

We have repeatedly proposed measures for a European *détente* and for safeguarding the security of the peoples living in the area. We are prepared to take both far-reaching steps to that end and any reasonable measures of a partial nature. All we want is that there should be progress, that the situation in Europe should keep improving and that the European knot should not remain tangled and taut.

The Middle East remains one of the trouble spots of the globe, where the situation is fraught with every kind of complication. True, there is at the moment no direct military intervention in the internal affairs of countries in the area by imperialist countries, as was the case in the recent past, but the situation is still far from normal.

It has to be said frankly that the situation there is not helped by the fact that the territory of certain countries is still being used by foreign powers—in some cases to an even greater extent than before—as a bridgehead for war preparations against third countries.

I have had occasion more than once to point out the harm caused to the interests of universal peace by countries which, being parties to aggressive blocs, allow foreign military bases to be established on their territory. I should like to return to this matter once more today.

Surely there can be no question of the promotion of peace by a country which has made the granting of its national territory for foreign rocket and nuclear bases directed against the Soviet Union almost the main principle of its policy. Turkey, for example, which is our southern neighbour, is a party to both NATO and CENTO, and the only bloc she has not yet joined is SEATO—probably because of the great distance. However, if they get a promise of so-called aid, even the great distance will no longer deter them. True, to promise "aid" is not the same as to give it. But I think that if the ruling circles of Turkey were just promised a sum of money, they would undoubtedly be happy to join SEATO or any other "ATO". (*Laughter.*)

But what is the chief result of Turkey's participation in military blocs? Turkish territory has been turned into a veritable military spring-board where henceforward there will also be foreign rockets with nuclear war-heads. It is hardly necessary to point out that this above all undermines the security of Turkey herself.

We have repeatedly spoken of the dangers of this trend in Turkish foreign policy, and have put forward concrete proposals with a view to establishing good-neighbourly relations between our two countries. We sincerely want our relations to develop in the spirit of the friendship and co-operation which were typical of the comparatively recent past, when Turkish policy was shaped by that outstanding leader, Kemal Atatürk.

Our relations with Iran, another southern neighbour of ours, leave much to be desired. In recent years the Soviet Government has taken a number of important steps designed to establish good, friendly relations with Iran. But the Iranian leaders, contrary to the national interests of their country, have preferred to commit themselves, both within the framework of the CENTO military bloc and outside it, to military undertakings directed against the Soviet Union.

A word in passing about the name of that bloc, which used to be called the Baghdad Pact. With due regard to the lessons of the recent past—lessons which were so grievous for the aggressive forces—the bloc is now called the Central Treaty Organisation, or CENTO for short. This is very indicative. You know that good old saying, "Once bitten, twice shy". The Baghdad Pact went up in smoke. So its inspirers could not bring themselves to rename it the Ankara or Teheran pact but thought up a non-committal name—CENTO.

Well, that is understandable. They must now be pretty certain that at least the name of the pact will survive. (*Laughter.*)

It should be clearly stated that this policy is not in the interests of a durable peace and better Soviet-Iranian relations. We shall have to judge of the future course of Iranian policy by the concrete actions of those who shape it.

But Turkey and Iran have all the objective opportunities needed to make a contribution to the relaxation of tension in that part of the world and to improve relations with their peace-loving neighbours.

The present attitude of the United States and certain other Western Powers to the Chinese People's Republic is causing serious concern to world opinion. People's China is a great country with a population of 650 millions, a country

which is undoubtedly playing a tremendous role in international affairs. But the ruling circles of the Western Powers would like to turn China into a second-rate power. In the West, they are still trying to suggest that there exist two Chinas and not one. But every schoolboy knows 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 has never been China's capital, nor will it ever be.

Furthermore, due to the attitude of the United States and its allies, the rights of the Chinese People's Republic in the United Nations have not yet been restored, although this is contrary to common sense. China fought together with the allies against Japan. She is one of the founders of the United Nations and one of the five permanent members of the Security Council. But her seat in the United Nations is at present occupied by impostors who as a result of the victory of the great revolution in China have by the will of her people been stripped of the right to represent China. These individuals have no more right to speak for China and the Chinese people than, say, Kerensky, who is ending his days in emigration, has a right to speak on behalf of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government.

It is well known that ten years ago the old, decayed regime was overthrown in China and the Chiang Kai-shek government thrown out as a result of the victory of the people's revolution. The Chinese People's Republic came into being. The Government of the Chinese People's Republic enjoys a prestige and trust inside the country such as no government has enjoyed throughout the long centuries of Chinese history. The Soviet Union has the friendliest relations with the Chinese People's Republic and its Government. Now that the Chinese People's Republic has entered the second decade of its existence, carried out great political, social and economic reforms and made outstanding progress in economy and culture, those who advocate the absurd idea of "two Chinas" look more ridiculous than ever.

Ignoring the obvious facts and the trend of history, the United States continues to cling to the remnants of the overthrown Chiang Kai-shek regime; it helped the Chiang clique to entrench itself in Taiwan, and protects it by force of arms. Thereby an attempt is being made to prevent the completion

of the process of the country's revolutionary liberation and the extension of the political system now existing throughout the rest of Chinese territory to Taiwan and other Chinese areas.

Interference in China's internal affairs and attempts to "correct" geography and create an artificial situation of "two Chinas" run counter to the peoples' desire to end the "cold war", and cause tension in the Far East.

China was one of the subjects touched on during the conversations I had in the United States. On that occasion I stated the Soviet point of view both on the so-called Taiwan question and on the question of restoring China's rights in the United Nations. But shortly afterwards Mr. Herter, the Secretary of State, and Mr. Dillon, his assistant, in their public statements began something in the nature of a psychological attack on the Soviet Union, deliberately misrepresenting the nature of Soviet-Chinese relations, and questioning the sovereignty of the Chinese People's Republic in dealing with matters of internal and foreign policy.

I do not know what that is called in American, but in Russian such attempts may be described as horse logic. (*Laughter.*) Surely it is clear to anyone that People's China is a great sovereign state and that her Government is carrying out an independent internal and foreign policy. And it is only right that Americans themselves laugh at the views expressed by the two State Department spokesmen. To give an example, the well-known American journalist, Walter Lippmann, correctly stressed that such utterances can only injure the cause of improving international co-operation and that it does not become U.S. statesmen to make in public that kind of official comment on the relations between the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic. Mr. Herter and Mr. Dillon should have known that such methods are useless in the case of the Soviet Union and People's China.

As regards the essence of the matter, it will be recalled that following the defeat of Japan the Island of Taiwan—the Americans prefer to call it Formosa—was restored to China. China's title to Taiwan is set down in the Cairo Declaration, whose signatories included the late U.S. President, Mr. Roosevelt, and in the Potsdam Declaration, signed by ex-President Truman, as well as in the Act of

Surrender of Japan. At one time the U.S. Government recognised that Taiwan had been restored to China and that the problem was thus settled for good. In 1950 Mr. Truman, then U.S. President, stated that Taiwan had been restored to China and that the United States and the other Allied Powers had agreed to the Chinese Government exercising authority over the island.

Hence the so-called Taiwan question is a question of relations between Chinese and Chinese, a purely domestic affair of China. No international complications would have arisen but for interference in the internal affairs of China, and for the situation artificially created in Taiwan as a result of U.S. military support and protection of the remnants of the Chiang Kai-shek regime.

We are convinced that Taiwan and the other islands will be reunited with the rest of China. Threats, whether explicit or implicit, are utterly useless in this matter. It should be borne in mind that even a small country can often not be stopped by threats when it is intent on realising its national aspirations. Threats are all the more useless in the case of a country as great as the Chinese People's Republic.

Those who speak of Soviet responsibility for China's actions should know that the Chinese People's Republic has no need for anyone's tutelage. The People's Government is pursuing a policy of its own and is a worthy spokesman for its people and the Chinese People's Republic.

However, speaking of the Soviet Union as an ally of the Chinese People's Republic, we are willing to bear responsibility. The Soviet Union appreciates and sympathises with the desire of the Chinese people and Government to restore to the Chinese state Taiwan and the other islands belonging to China but occupied by foreign troops. We fully support the Government of the Chinese People's Republic in this matter and shall continue to do so until it achieves a solution, for legally and morally it is in the right. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Another Far Eastern problem that merits attention is the Korean question. Korea is split into two parts. As matters stand on the Korean peninsula today, it is unlikely that a military conflict will break out there. True, the aged Syngman Rhee is trying to fan war hysteria, but

the Korean People's Democratic Republic is taking his threats calmly as it continues confidently to build socialism. Both the economic and the political situation in the Korean People's Democratic Republic today is good; the country is successfully healing the wounds of war and is daily growing stronger.

The situation in South Korea is quite different. Her economy, particularly her agriculture, continues to decline. She is ruined and even Syngman Rhee has to reckon with the fact that his subjects are anything but eager to go to war against their North Korean brothers. Besides, Syngman Rhee seems to realise that if he unleashes a war against the Korean People's Democratic Republic, it may rapidly develop into a major war. And he knows full well that it is not only South Korea that has allies; so has the Korean People's Democratic Republic. (*Applause.*)

With regard to the main determining force of South Korean policy, our impression is that the United States does not seek a military conflict there. Today the alignment of forces in that corner of the globe, too, is unfavourable to those who would like to decide ideological issues by war or other non-peaceful means.

That being so, favourable conditions are arising for preparing step by step a final solution of the Korean problem. This should be begun by withdrawing foreign troops from South Korea. We are certain that if there were no foreign troops in Korea and no outside interference in her affairs, the Koreans themselves would be able the sooner to reach agreement on a gradual rapprochement between North and South, which, in its turn, would provide the prerequisites for the re-establishment of Korean national unity on peaceful, democratic lines.

Lately the question of the situation in Laos has acquired an unpleasant flavour. How did the question arise? Well-known circles which seek to expand the aggressive SEATO bloc rather than to promote peace in South-East Asia first secured the adjournment of the International Commission for Laos set up by the 1954 Geneva Conference. Then they set out to complicate the situation in Laos herself, where the former Pathet Lao forces began to be persecuted, in direct violation of the Geneva agreements. Arms were also used. Although hostilities in Laos are being conducted on a

platoon scale, an undue fuss has been raised over them on a world scale.

As regards the Soviet Union, we are opposed to the existence of even a small hotbed of war in Laos, a hotbed that would bring grist to the mill of aggressive forces. Given a reasonable approach, and adherence to international agreements, the skirmishes which are taking place there can be ended and the situation normalised. The important thing is that the Great Powers should not interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, or else there may be undesirable consequences.

We very much regret the incidents that have recently occurred on the border of two states friendly to us—the Chinese People's Republic, with which we are linked by indestructible bonds of fraternal friendship, and the Republic of India, with which our friendly relations are making good progress. We are particularly distressed by the fact that the incidents in question have resulted in loss of life on both sides. Nothing can compensate the parents and other relatives of the dead for their loss. We should be happy if there were to be no more incidents on the Chinese-Indian border and if existing frontier disputes were settled through friendly negotiation to the satisfaction of both parties.

I think there is no need to speak of relations between the Soviet Union and all other countries. I have here only mentioned those key issues, or points, which to some degree or another give cause for concern about the present international situation. No particular changes have occurred lately in any other countries or points of the globe.

There is a case for saying that we have every reason to be satisfied with the relations which have formed between our country and most other countries, especially those with which the Soviet Union has friendly relations that are expanding and growing stronger. But we should also like to improve relations and achieve complete mutual understanding, such as would develop into friendship, with those countries with which the mutual understanding that is needed is still lacking. The international *détente* so far achieved has led to a further expansion of our relations with countries both in the East and in the West. We must firmly pursue our Leninist policy of peace, and we shall do so with unswerving consistency. (*Prolonged applause.*)



## THE DISARMAMENT PROBLEM MUST BE SOLVED

Comrade Deputies, during my U.S. visit I submitted to the United Nations, on behalf of the Soviet Government, a proposal for general and complete disarmament. As you know, this proposal of the Soviet Union has been very favourably received in all countries of the world.

We Soviet people believe that the disarmament problem is the paramount problem of our day. Whether mankind heads for peace or war, depends on whether or not we succeed in finding a solution to this problem. There seems to be no disagreement on this point today.

Never before in the history of mankind have the peoples had to allocate so enormous a share of their labour to the manufacture of means of destruction. The arms race has become all-embracing. The armed forces are growing, so-called conventional armaments are being increased and improved and the stockpiles of nuclear bombs and rocket weapons keep increasing. The *New York Herald Tribune* reported that some 250 nuclear explosions had been carried out between July 1945 and the end of last year, their aggregate force approximating to 100 million tons of TNT. The force of those explosions far exceeds the combined force of all the bombs, mines and missiles exploded during the First and Second World wars. And yet the nuclear bombs tested so far constitute a very small portion of the atomic and hydrogen weapons stored up. This is what mankind has come to as a result of the arms race.

Until recently great distances—oceans, for example—were natural barriers to the spread of wars from one continent to another. The First and Second World wars ravaged chiefly Europe. Some countries were still able to escape unscathed thanks to vast oceans or great distances. They were able not only to avoid destruction and the other calamities of war, but also to make enormous profits from war.

The situation has now changed. Within a few minutes, the most devastating means of destruction—nuclear weapons—can be dispatched to any point on the globe. A new war would spare no one, and would involve mankind in unprecedented loss of life, destruction and suffering. There would be no difference between front and rear or between soldier and civilian.

There must be general and complete disarmament if we are to avert war. It is with this end in view that the Soviet Government has submitted the proposals you know about to the United Nations.

What is the essence of the programme put forward by the Soviet Union? We propose that the states should effect general and complete disarmament in the shortest possible time—roughly four years. This implies that they must disband all armed forces, scrap all arms and stop war production. Nuclear, chemical, bacteriological and rocket weapons would be banned completely and for ever, and destroyed; war ministries and general staffs would be abolished, military bases on foreign soil would be dismantled, no one would do military training any longer, and all military spending would cease.

The states would retain only small agreed contingents of police or militia intended to safeguard internal order and the security of citizens, and equipped only with small arms.

To prevent any country from violating the agreement on complete disarmament, we propose the establishment of rigid, effective and comprehensive international control.

General and complete disarmament would initiate a new stage in the development of human society, the stage of peace uninterrupted by wars.

General and complete disarmament would also lead to a tremendous rise in the standard of living of all nations. The discontinuance of military expenditures would release immense resources for the expansion of the civilian branches of the economy in all countries, both large and small. Substantial means could be diverted to the promotion of the economies and living standards of the populations of economically underdeveloped countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Numerous factories, power stations, irrigation installations, houses, schools and hospitals could be built there. The scientists of all countries would receive vast additional opportunities for work for the benefit of peace, for the welfare of peoples, for more extensive research in the most varied fields—technology, medicine, outer space and so on. They would be able to combine their efforts in carrying out numerous big scientific projects.

If we were now to attempt at least a preliminary appraisal of the reaction of world opinion to the Soviet disarmament

proposals, it would be fair to say that our proposals stirred the widest sections of the population in all countries. The Soviet Government's disarmament proposals won the approval of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of China and were unanimously supported in the other socialist countries.

Today the disarmament problem is not just a matter for negotiation by diplomats or for investigation by experts, but a vital issue for public effort involving the overwhelming majority of mankind.

During my American visit we discussed the disarmament problem with President Eisenhower. I am pleased to note that Mr. Eisenhower declares for seeking a solution to the disarmament problem. We consider that the reaction to the Soviet proposals on the part of Mr. Macmillan, the British Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru, the Indian Prime Minister, Mr. Sukarno, the Indonesian President, and others is of positive importance to the forthcoming negotiations. It is gratifying that during the discussion of our proposals at the current session of the U.N. General Assembly most delegates voiced, in one way or another, support for the idea of general and complete disarmament.

Public bodies and political and business groups in various countries show great interest in our disarmament proposals. In particular, we welcome the statement made by Dr. Geoffrey Fisher, Archbishop of Canterbury, whom we wish to thank for his correct appraisal and support of the Soviet proposals for general and complete disarmament. The fact that it came from an archbishop who heads the Church of England, and who from a Christian standpoint recognised the humane character of our proposals, is of particular value. It is to be expected that he will be followed by other believers, by ministers of other religions—that is, if they are really guided by what their respective religions say about peace among men and the impermissibility of wars between peoples.

To be sure, the favourable reaction to our proposals on the part of large sections of public opinion does not at all mean that there are not, or will not be, any major obstacles to the forthcoming disarmament talks. We take a realistic view of things and we see very well that our proposals for general and complete disarmament are far from being to

everyone's liking. There are still advocates of the arms race and the "cold war" in the world, there are influential capitalist monopolies which are deriving huge profits from the arms race. They will not scruple to use any means in their efforts to obstruct general and complete disarmament and, in fact, they are not idle even now. True, world opinion's favourable reaction to the Soviet proposals now prevents them from openly raising their voice against the proposals. They resort to roundabout manoeuvres, distorting the essence of the proposals and deliberately spreading cock-and-bull stories about them.

Some people in the West are trying to question the sincerity of our proposals. But we are already familiar with this sort of unfair methods.

The Soviet Government has always advocated disarmament. We have fought against militarism and for disarmament ever since the Soviet state was born. In the early days of the October Revolution, Lenin called for an end to war. The Soviet Government disbanded the armed forces and we adopted the militia system. Afterwards, when we were attacked, we had to form an army to defend our country. This measure, incidentally, was imposed upon us by none other than Germany, Britain, France, the United States and Japan, who moved their troops into our country; they aided the enemies of the Revolution with armed forces and supplies. The Soviet people were compelled to arm in order to uphold their revolutionary gains and the independence of their country.

Later, when the League of Nations was established, the Soviet Government made far-reaching proposals for disarmament and the destruction of arms. Those proposals were submitted by the Soviet delegate, Maxim Litvinov.

We have now proposed general and complete disarmament on a new basis, with due regard to the changed situation and the different alignment of forces which obtains in the world.

Formerly some rejected our proposals, contending that they would benefit only the Soviet Union because it was then weak. Yes, at that time the Soviet Union was in fact the only socialist country and was no doubt far weaker than now. But even then, in putting forward our disarmament proposals, we were prompted by the humane idea of preserving peace on earth.

The alignment of forces today is entirely different. During the Second World War, together with our allies, we defeated a powerful enemy. After the war the Soviet people successfully rebuilt their national economy and made unprecedented progress in economy and culture, in science and engineering, and in the standard of living of the mass of the people. It is universally recognised that the Soviet Union is a mighty world power. Today the Soviet Union is no longer alone, for there exists the great camp of socialist countries. In these circumstances, none can assert that our proposals for general and complete disarmament are prompted by weakness. We have all that we need to defend our country against all encroachments from without and to administer a shattering rebuff to the enemy. (*Prolonged applause.*) We are in a position not only to ensure non-interference in our own affairs, but also to help fraternal socialist countries to defend their achievements, their freedom and independence. (*Prolonged applause.*)

That is why it should be quite evident that the disarmament proposals we have now submitted are prompted by humane considerations, and are intended to rule out war, for war is the cause of terrible calamities in this age of thermonuclear weapons. We do not want to use for military purposes the advantages which we have now and which will grow as the socialist countries continue to progress.

Our entire policy, based as it is on Marxist-Leninist theory, is inspired by solicitude for man, for the happiness of the peoples. For this reason, we are against war. (*Stormy applause.*)

In the Western countries, there are leaders who refuse to discard their old views; they maintain that one should be strong and should impose one's will upon the weak from "positions of strength". They are surreptitiously trying to undermine people's faith in the practicability of the Soviet proposals. They misrepresent our proposals for control, though it was stated plainly, both in my address to the U.N. General Assembly and in the Declaration of the Soviet Government, that provided there is general disarmament, we are prepared to accept general control.

It is enough to look carefully into our proposals to see that the Soviet Government proposes establishing rigid international control over all disarmament measures. For

each stage of disarmament, we propose establishing an appropriate stage of control. We also imply that the controllers will be on the territory of the countries concerned from the very beginning of the disarmament process to its completion, and also after disarmament has been effected, so that no country will make secret war preparations. We are for the scope of control being in accordance with the nature of the disarmament measures implemented.

We are also willing to set up appropriate agencies, which should apparently be under the aegis of the United Nations, with a view to guaranteeing effective control to ensure that all states which assume solemn disarmament undertakings carry them out unflinchingly.

In a speech on the occasion of United Nations Week, Mr. Harriman took a sceptical view of the Soviet Government's proposals; our proposals seem to have made a deep impression on him. In his heart he probably refuses to accept them, so he has assumed the unseemly role of a worm trying to undermine faith in them.

The discussion of the disarmament question was no sooner begun than sceptics pushed to the fore the question of what international forces should be set up to replace national forces. If we read between the lines, we shall most probably see that the idea is to establish international forces subject to the influence of the countries which today, owing to the policy of blocs, control a majority in the United Nations. This is very reminiscent of the policy of forming military blocs, such as NATO, SEATO or CENTO. Such a policy in no way contributes to disarmament. We are for disarmament, but it has to be a fair disarmament.

If all countries disarm and no longer have armaments or armed forces, none of them will be able to start war. That being so, why have supra-national armed forces?

We consider that if general and complete disarmament is effected, it will be possible to find forces that will exert a moral influence, and to apply various measures and sanctions in accordance with decisions of the United Nations to any country which risks starting a conflict.

Those advocating the formation of international armed forces have one object in mind—to prevent countries from accepting our disarmament proposals. While paying lip-service to the idea of disarmament, they in effect want to

leave the situation unchanged, that is, to go on sitting on a powder keg, in constant fear of nuclear weapons being used.

It is to be hoped that common sense will triumph. Sooner or later, reasonable decisions will be taken which will enable the peoples to live in friendship, trusting each other and refraining from interference in the affairs of other countries.

The enemies of peace resort to yet another manoeuvre to discredit the Soviet disarmament programme. They allege that the Soviet stand on the disarmament question is one of "all or nothing", that is, that we propose general and complete disarmament and refuse to accept anything less. That is not true.

Our proposals state in black and white that if the Western Powers are not prepared to accept general and complete disarmament, we consider it possible and necessary to reach agreement at least on partial disarmament steps. The Soviet Union believes that measures of this kind should include a ban on nuclear weapons and, primarily, the discontinuance of tests; the establishment of a control and inspection zone and the simultaneous reduction of the strength of foreign troops stationed in the European countries concerned; the establishment of an atom-free zone in Central Europe; the abolition of military bases on foreign soil; the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries, etc.

It goes without saying that the Soviet Government is prepared to consider and discuss amendments to our proposals, as well as other proposals designed to solve the disarmament problem. It should be emphasised, however, that the disarmament question has now become particularly important and acute, and also urgent. On its solution depends the peoples' well-being and security and whether there will be war or peace.

I take pleasure in pointing out that the proposals for general and complete disarmament have won approval in the U.N. Political Committee thanks to the understanding reached between the Soviet Union and the United States. The draft of a joint Soviet-American resolution on the matter was vigorously supported by the British, French and other delegates. It has been officially announced, as you know,

that the delegations of the other 80 U.N. members associated themselves with the joint draft as co-authors.

We cordially welcome this unanimous decision. We must not, however, be deluded by what has been achieved, for there still are forces that will do their utmost to prevent the adoption of practical measures to secure general and complete disarmament.

There are woodworms which do not fell a tree because they cannot do so; but they bore in its bark and destroy it, robbing the tree of sap. The result is that the tree dies on the root. In the same way, certain politicians will try to undermine the proposals for general and complete disarmament that we have submitted.

It is necessary to expose the opponents of disarmament and to administer them a firm rebuff if we want the dearest hopes of the peoples to be fulfilled.

Comrade Deputies, it is now obvious that the problems facing the world can be solved only from positions of reason and not of strength. These problems must be settled by the only reasonable method, that of negotiation. I wish to lay special stress on the great importance of the agreement reached with Mr. Eisenhower, the U.S. President, to the effect that all outstanding international issues should be settled, not by the use of force, but by peaceful means, through negotiation.

Speaking of negotiations as a method, it is of the utmost importance to call a conference of Heads of Government. We discussed the question of calling a conference of Heads of Government, or a summit conference as it is called, with President Eisenhower, and I must say that there is mutual understanding on the matter between us. It will be recalled that following our conversations President Eisenhower said that the exchange of views had eliminated many of the objections to a summit conference that had existed until then. The British Prime Minister, Mr. Macmillan, has for his part repeatedly declared that he favours a summit conference.

The Soviet Government fully shares the opinion that such a conference ought to be held as early as possible. We hope that the governments of other countries will likewise take a constructive stand on the matter.

Some Western statesmen are now voicing the view that a summit conference should be held only when the main

disputes have been preliminarily settled, and claim that only then will a meeting of Heads of Government be effective. But this is a line of reasoning fit only for those who do not take account of the actual situation or who would like to mislead people lacking in political experience. If the fundamental issues were to be settled before the Heads of Government met, then it would be a meeting, not for the settlement of pressing issues, but for joint fishing (I don't care for fishing, and I don't fish), listening to concerts and so on, that is, for pleasant recreation.

One must face realities and have a realistic understanding of what is expected of a meeting of Heads of Government. The thing to do now is to settle the more pressing issues.

It will be recalled that some of them have already been examined by the Geneva Foreign Ministers conference and other international conferences, but no solutions have been found. In fact, in some cases things reached a point where the situation was aggravated.

What is to be done, then? We have said more than once that only the Heads of Government, who are vested with great powers, can solve the more difficult world problems. They alone are capable of clearing away the impediments and abnormalities which have arisen in international relations during the many years of "cold war". Right now we are passing through a period when a meeting of the Heads of Government is essential. The sooner such a meeting takes place, the better for peace.

What questions should be discussed at a summit conference, as far as we can say?

Those should evidently be the questions which, being unsettled, are causing the greatest anxiety in the world, hindering a further international *détente*. The disarmament question, with which the whole world is preoccupied, should naturally be most prominent. We consider that, in the interests of peace, the conference should examine the question of a German peace treaty, and of settling the situation in West Berlin as a logical sequel to it. Other international matters of universal interest could also be discussed.

The success of a summit conference would be promoted by a firm decision of all countries not to take any steps likely to worsen the situation on the eve of the conference, increase

distrust in the relations between those attending it and sow the seeds of suspicion.

As for the Soviet Union, it will do all it can to help in improving the situation further before the summit conference meets.

\* \* \*

Comrade Deputies, the Soviet Government sees it as its duty to our people and the whole of mankind to consolidate the relaxation of tension achieved in international relations, firmly to steer a course leading from a *détente* to the complete removal of international tension and to turn the *détente* achieved into a durable peace.

With these aims in view, it is necessary:

vigorously to pursue a policy of improving the relations between countries;

to bring about, step by step, a practical solution of all pressing international issues in order to assure the peoples a peaceful existence;

unrelentingly to exercise vigilance with regard to those forces and circles which are bent on turning international developments back to the path of cold war and the aggravation of relations between countries; indefatigably to show the peoples that this attitude of bellicose militarist circles is untenable, that it is harmful and disastrous to mankind.

If all the forces which stand for a peaceful settlement of international issues are brought into action, if the leading groups which shape the policies of Western countries come to realise that nowadays it is impossible to pursue any policy other than that of peaceful coexistence, and if the peoples speak out firmly against war, then decisive progress will be made before long towards removing the war menace, and a clear, bright road to peace will lie open for all mankind.

The Soviet Government, for its part, will do all it can to fulfil that great task.

Allow me to express confidence that this session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. will approve the foreign policy of the Soviet Government. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Comrade Deputies, the continued struggle for a durable peace and for a solid basis for the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems will require great

efforts by the Soviet Union, the other socialist countries and all the peace-loving peoples.

The consistent peace policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries is meeting with increasing support among the peace-loving forces of the whole world. The stronger and more united the great family of socialist countries, the faster and more successfully the tasks of strengthening world peace will be fulfilled.

We state with deep satisfaction that all the countries of the world socialist system are more united than ever. Shoulder to shoulder they are working for the solution of the historic problem of freeing humanity from war and ensuring the development of the peoples along the lines of peace and social progress.

The Soviet people, together with the peoples of the other socialist countries, recently celebrated the glorious 10th anniversary of the birth of the Chinese People's Republic and the German Democratic Republic, and the 15th anniversary of the establishment of people's rule in Poland, Rumania and Bulgaria. The building of a new life is making good progress in all the socialist countries.

Allow me, comrades, to convey on your behalf, on behalf of the Soviet people, heartfelt greetings to our brothers in the People's Democracies and to wish them further success in the building of socialism. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The Soviet Union is marching confidently on, successfully accomplishing the tasks of the building of communism set by the 21st Congress of the C.P.S.U. Our Soviet motherland is making excellent progress. The assignments for the first year of the Seven-Year Plan are being successfully fulfilled and overfulfilled. This 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 seen further major achievements in industry, farming, culture and science, and an improvement in the living standard of the people. As you know, industry has substantially exceeded the state plan for the first nine months of the year. According to preliminary estimates, it will exceed the annual plan by roughly 4 per cent, which will mean more than 40,000 million rubles' worth of products over and above the plan. Socialist agriculture, too, is on the upgrade. The coming plenary

meeting of the C.C. C.P.S.U. will examine the question of the further development of that important branch of the national economy.

Of all our achievements, the most important, most noteworthy and most cheering is the unprecedented growth of the political and labour activity, creative enthusiasm and communist awareness of the Soviet people and of their solid unity behind the Communist Party. We see this as the source of all our successes and as an earnest of the complete victory of communism. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

Every day brings us happy news of further achievements of the Soviet people. Surely we have reason to rejoice and take pride in the feats accomplished by the Soviet people, such as the successful launching of three space rockets during 1959 alone, which won the admiration of all mankind. All Soviet people salute the men of science and labour who have blazed a trail into space. (*Stormy applause.*)

Our wonderful scientists have these days presented their country with yet another gift. They courted the moon so well that she favoured them with the permission to photograph that side of her which she had always concealed from man's gaze. (*Prolonged applause.*)

We take legitimate pride in the Soviet scientists who have persuaded the moon to remove her veil, that survival of the past. (*Laughter, applause.*) Under the impact of Soviet scientific and cultural progress, the moon discarded her veil and fell into step with the times, revealing her face to Soviet scientists and the Soviet people. And they, in turn, enabled the rest of the world to learn some of the cherished secrets of the celestial beauty. With her permission, of course. We are not in the habit of looking at things that are not intended for general inspection. (*Laughter, applause.*)

As I speak from this lofty rostrum, allow me, on behalf of the Soviet Government, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. and the Central Committee of our Communist Party, to extend heartfelt congratulations to our heroic scientists on their glorious scientific feat. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Allow me to wish them further successes and discoveries, and new achievements as brilliant as this, to the glory of our great country—the country of triumphing communism—

in the name of the victory of peace on earth. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Comrades, the Third Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. has met on the eve of the 42nd anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Under the glorious banner of October, the Soviet people are marching with firm step along the path shown by the great Lenin, to the complete victory of communism. (*Stormy, prolonged applause. All rise.*)

**RESOLUTION  
OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE U.S.S.R.  
ON THE REPORT MADE BY N. S. KHRUSHCHOV,  
CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS  
OF THE U.S.S.R.,  
ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION  
AND THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE U.S.S.R.**

Adopted on October 31, 1959

(*Gazette of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.,  
No. 44, 1959*)

Having heard and considered the report made by Comrade N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., on the international situation and the foreign policy of the U.S.S.R., the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics *resolves:*

Fully and completely to approve the foreign policy of the Soviet Government.

MESSAGE  
OF THE SUPREME SOVIET  
OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS  
TO THE PARLIAMENTS OF ALL COUNTRIES  
OF THE WORLD

Adopted on October 31, 1959

*(Gazette of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.,  
No. 44, 1959)*

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 age of the atom, electronics and the conquest of outer space has opened up immense, breathtaking vistas for scientific and technological progress. But, on the other hand, mankind finds itself faced with the real menace of these great discoveries being used for the extermination of people and the destruction of material wealth.

Enormous stocks of means of annihilation possessing tremendous destructive power have already been accumulated. Nevertheless, the arms race goes on gathering momentum, sucking more and more countries into its monstrous whirlpool and squeezing the life-blood out of nations. Truly fabulous sums are being wasted on the production of deadly weapons, while millions of people, and many nations, still live in poverty, and are deprived of living conditions worthy of man. The arms race and the "cold war" mar the relations between countries, raising artificial barriers that hamper contacts between peoples and trade between countries, and retard their economic development.

The arms race is dragging mankind into the maelstrom of a new war. At a time when relations between states are dominated by a spirit of distrust and hostility, when armed forces many millions strong confront each other and bombers carrying lethal cargoes of nuclear arms are kept in the

air, the slightest false step may precipitate disaster. Then, in a matter of minutes, a war will break out in which there will be no distinction between front and rear or between soldier and civilian. The destruction of thousands of towns and villages, of factories and mills, the loss of hundreds of millions of human lives, and the destruction of priceless cultural monuments will be the inevitable outcome unless the peoples, parliaments and governments succeed in calling a halt to this trend.

What is the way out? How is the present situation to be ended? How are people to be assured a quiet, peaceful life?

There is a sure and reliable means of ruling out the possibility of war. It is general and complete disarmament of states. When the means of waging war are destroyed, all weapons eliminated and armies disbanded, then, and thereby, conditions will be provided for a durable peace on earth, a peace uninterrupted by wars and bloodshed.

General and complete disarmament will place all countries on an equal footing. It will injure no country and will, in fact, guarantee the security of all peoples. There will be no more apprehensions that measures to reduce arms may benefit some countries to the detriment of others—apprehensions which arose when it was only a question of partial disarmament. There will no longer be any difficulties of control obstructing disarmament. If disarmament is complete and general, then control, too, will be comprehensive and complete.

General and complete disarmament will usher in a truly new stage in the history of international relations. The peaceful coexistence of states with different social and economic systems will be reliably guaranteed. All countries will live as good neighbours. There will be new opportunities for the development of economic, cultural and commercial relations between countries and peoples. Today many international problems seem insoluble. But as soon as the arms race is stopped and armies abolished, there will be new opportunities and ways of settling them.

Vast material and financial resources that are today being spent on armaments will be released. The number of houses, schools and hospitals, of factories, power stations, dams and roads, that it will be possible to build by using those re-



sources! Taxes, which are now swallowing an increasing proportion of the incomes of workers and peasants, will be sharply reduced. Inexhaustible possibilities will arise for carrying out great scientific and technological projects; scientists and specialists will be enabled to serve only peace and prosperity.

General and complete disarmament will open a new chapter in the history of the development of the economically underdeveloped countries. At the moment economic progress in those countries is very slow. Millions of people in Asia, Africa and Latin America still have to subsist on a starvation or semi-starvation diet. Disarmament, by releasing huge material and financial resources, will help in redressing this injustice and will accelerate the elimination of the age-long backwardness of the underdeveloped and colonial countries by providing a new source of economic aid for them.

Can general and complete disarmament be achieved at the present stage? Is it not utopia?

No, today it is not utopia. The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. expresses firm confidence that this objective is quite attainable. Several decades ago, there were not sufficient forces and means for the realisation of the idea of general and complete disarmament, but now this idea has become the watchword of vast human masses, of entire peoples and nations. There is today a large group of states working consistently for its realisation.

It is within man's power to solve the disarmament problem. Man has created destructive weapons. He can and must destroy them.

The outlook for solving this most pressing problem of today is all the more propitious because certain changes for the better have taken place of late in the development of international relations. The absurdity and danger of the continued arms race is dawning on increasing sections of the population, members of parliament, public leaders and statesmen. Everywhere there is a growing urge to end the "cold war" and to settle outstanding international issues without the use of force, by negotiation and agreement.

The visit of N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., to the United States and his interviews with President Eisenhower played an outstanding role in achieving an international *détente*.

A real opportunity is now opening up for mankind of giving the development of international relations a new turn by calling a halt to the arms race and making the method of negotiation the only method of settling international issues.

Everything now depends on the will and perseverance of the peoples.

In this connection, a special responsibility rests with parliaments, governments and statesmen. The peoples and voters expect their parliaments to speak up. It is the parliaments and governments that must perseveringly and purposefully seek ways of settling international disputes, primarily the most burning problem of our times—the disarmament problem.

There are no political, economic or other reasons justifying the continuation of the arms race. Disarmament is opposed only by those circles which put their selfish interests first and to which the hopes and aspirations of the peoples are alien. But the resistance of those circles can be overcome. The vital interests of mankind make it imperative that that resistance be broken.

There are practical ways of solving the problem of general and complete disarmament. They are indicated in the proposals of the Soviet Government submitted to the United Nations. Whether the production of weapons of death and devastation will be ceased and the accumulated stocks of arms destroyed, whether mankind will take the road of a disastrous war or embark on peaceful development, now depends directly on the governments and parliaments of other countries, above all the biggest countries, on their goodwill and desire.

As far as the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. and the Soviet Government are concerned, they will, in compliance with the will of the Soviet people, do all in their power to secure a solution of the disarmament problem and to transform the international *détente* which has been achieved into a durable peace.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., fully approving the peaceful initiative of the Soviet Government, which has submitted to the United Nations a programme for general and complete disarmament, expresses confidence that the noble initiative of the Soviet Government will be appre-

ciated and supported by the parliaments and governments of other countries.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. hopes that the parliaments and members of parliament in all countries will for their part do all in their power to free the peoples from a terrible scourge, the arms race, to bring about disarmament and to pave the way to everlasting peace for all mankind.

## REPORT

by Deputy N. S. KHRUSHCHOV,  
Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.,  
First Secretary of the C.C. C.P.S.U.,

"Disarmament for Durable Peace and Friendship"

Delivered at the Fourth Session  
of the Fifth Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.  
on January 14, 1960

*(Sittings of the Fourth Session  
of the Fifth Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.  
Verbatim Record)*

Comrade Deputies, the more important measures of the Soviet Government aimed at easing international tension and promoting peace were dealt with in the report on the international situation and the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, presented to the last session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.

The Soviet proposals for general and complete disarmament, submitted to the United Nations, were received with deep satisfaction by the peoples of all countries of the world. The U.N. General Assembly gave unanimous approval to the idea of general and complete disarmament.

The Message addressed by the Supreme Soviet to the parliaments of all nations found support with the parliaments and governments of the socialist countries and with many members of parliament of various countries on all continents.

In consistently pursuing a foreign policy of peace and acting upon the Leninist principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, the Soviet Government has been carrying out step by step the concrete measures outlined in the proposal for general and complete disarmament.

The Council of Ministers and the Central Committee of the Communist Party have decided to submit new specific

proposals for a reduction of the armed forces of our country to this session of the Supreme Soviet.

Before I present these proposals, allow me to deal with some questions bearing on our domestic situation, international affairs and the foreign policy of the Soviet Union.

### A YEAR OF GREAT VICTORIES IN THE BUILDING OF COMMUNISM

Comrade Deputies, the year 1959 will go down in history as the first year of the extensive building of communist society in our country. In implementing the majestic programme of building communism adopted by the Twenty-First C.P.S.U. Congress, the Soviet people have scored new and outstanding achievements in developing the country's productive forces, creating the material and technical base for communism and raising material and cultural standards. The past year has seen the further strengthening of the Soviet social and political system, the continued development of socialist democracy and the heightening of the organising and educational role of the Communist Party. It has been a year of fresh successes for our foreign policy, which aims at preserving and consolidating world peace, relaxing international tension, and further strengthening the world socialist system.

The Soviet people, our friends abroad and everyone capable of realistically assessing the march of events, have every reason to regard 1959 as a year of continued victorious advance in the building of communism. It opened up a broad and clear prospect for the settlement of the cardinal international problems that have such an important bearing on the consolidation of peace.

There is the folk saying that a good start is half the job. And we have made a good start on our seven-year plan. Socialist emulation for its pre-schedule fulfilment has spread throughout the country. The labour effort of our people has yielded excellent results. In the past year gross industrial output increased more than 11 per cent, as against the planned 7.7 per cent. Output over and above the plan amounted to nearly 50,000 million rubles. To appreciate the significance of that figure, it need only be said that it is more than the

total industrial output of pre-revolutionary Russia in present-day prices.

Now as in the past, our economic development has been guided by the Lenin principle of a higher rate of growth in the heavy industries. Output of means of production increased 12 per cent, as against the planned 8.1 per cent. There were substantial gains in ferrous and nonferrous metals, coal, oil, gas, power, chemicals, building materials, machinery and equipment. For example, the 1959 increase in steel output was set at 4.1 million tons, the actual increase was 5 million tons. In coal, the planned increase was 6.1 million tons and the actual increase 10.4 million. In oil, the target increase was 14.5 million tons and the actual increase 16.3 million. Electric power output is up 28,600 million kwh from 1958, as against the planned increase of 22,400 million kwh. Ninety-one thousand tons more paper was produced than last year.

In drawing up the seven-year plan we wanted to avoid excessive strain in its fulfilment, and avoid fettering the initiative of Economic Councils, individual enterprises, Party, trade-union and other public organisations and of the people generally in bringing out latent reserves, making more efficient use of productive capacity and raising the productivity of social labour in their effort to exceed the seven-year programme. The correctness of that course has been fully confirmed. Experience has shown that the seven-year plan will be completed ahead of schedule and its target figures surpassed by a considerable margin.

The light and food industries are making good headway. These are some of the production gains over 1958: textiles—346 million square metres, knit goods—44 million pieces, leather footwear—33 million pairs, sugar—576,000 tons. Over-all output of manufactured consumer goods was to have risen 6.6 per cent; the actual gain was 10.3 per cent.

The victories scored by our farmers inspire in our people a feeling of gratification and justified pride. The recent plenary meeting of the Communist Party Central Committee reviewed progress in the initial year of the seven-year plan and charted out measures for a further advance in all the key branches of agriculture. Due to drought in several areas, the 1959 gross grain harvest was below that of the record year 1958. Nonetheless, state grain purchases amounted to

2,846 million poods. This is sufficient to satisfy the needs of the population and other state requirements. An especially important part in the national grain supply was played by the newly-developed lands. State purchases in these areas amounted to 1,693 million poods, or over 1,000 million poods more than before these lands were brought under the plough.

Big gains were made in cotton farming.

Impressive achievements were registered in livestock. The following figures show the increase in state purchases in 1959 over 1958: livestock and poultry—1,900,000 tons, milk—2,900,000 tons, eggs—1,100 million, wool—38,000 tons. Compared with 1953, meat purchases were 2.1 times, milk nearly 2.4 times, eggs 2.2 times and wool 1.8 times bigger.

Increased gross and marketable output has been attended by an increase in the livestock population. The number of dairy and beef cattle in state and collective farms rose 18 per cent (cows 14 per cent), pigs 17 per cent, sheep 6 per cent and poultry 26 per cent.

Fulfilment of the Twenty-First Party Congress decisions and of the measures adopted by the recent Central Committee Plenum will ensure an even steeper rise in every branch of agriculture and an abundance of agricultural produce.

Work has begun on the grand capital construction programme provided for by the seven-year plan. Over 1,000 major state industrial enterprises were commissioned last year, in addition to the new capacities resulting from reconstruction, extension and technical re-equipment of functioning plants. The volume of capital investment by state and co-operative organisations, exclusive of collective farms, totalled 275,000 million rubles, an advance of 30,000 million over 1958.

This immense construction programme required big accumulations, and these depend, primarily, upon increased labour productivity, reduced production costs, and higher profits. Here, too, the seven-year programme targets are being surpassed. The 1959 plan called for a 5.4 per cent increase in industrial labour productivity and 8 per cent in the building trades; the factual increase was 7.4 per cent in industry and 9 per cent in building. Industrial production costs have been lowered to a figure below that stipulated in the plan, and this alone has given us an extra saving of

upwards of 10,000 million rubles. Bigger output and reduced production costs enabled industry to raise its profit by over 20 per cent as against 1958, and to a considerably higher figure than provided for by the plan. In a socialist economy, growing profits are a very important matter, because the profits are not pocketed by monopolists, but accrue to the people and are used to the advantage of society.

A key objective of the seven-year plan is an uninterrupted rise in living standards. The national income—and in a socialist country the material well-being of the people depends primarily upon its growth—increased last year by approximately 100,000 million rubles, or 8 per cent above 1958.

In 1959 the Communist Party and Soviet Government implemented a number of far-reaching measures aimed at raising the material standards of the people and improving living conditions generally. Over 13 million industrial and office workers had gone over to a shorter, seven- or six-hour day, by the end of last year and the change-over to the shorter workday for all industrial and office workers will be completed by the end of this year. In contrast to capitalist countries, where a shorter workday and workweek mean wage cuts, in this country reduction of working time has not meant reduction of wages. In a number of industries, in fact, it has been attended by a substantial rise in wages, particularly in the case of the lower-paid categories.

We know, of course, that in our country material and cultural standards are determined not only by cash wages, salaries and collective-farm payments. We have another method, one possible only in a socialist society, of raising living standards—through our social services. State expenditure on social insurance benefits, pensions, scholarships, free education, free medical treatment and other social services increased from 215,000 million rubles in 1958 to 230,000 million in 1959.

Housing construction in 1959 added up to over 80 million square metres of floor space, or more than 2,200,000 modern apartments. This is in addition to about 850,000 homes built by collective farmers and other members of the rural community. This means that the task set by the Communist Party and the Soviet Government of eliminating the housing shortage is being successfully accomplished.

Larger output by the light and food industries and more agricultural produce have made for a steady increase in popular consumption. Sales by state and co-operative retail trading organisations were up 8 per cent from 1958, with considerable increases in sales of foodstuffs, footwear, clothing, and household and recreational goods.

The uninterrupted rise in living standards, better health and medical treatment facilities have contributed to an increase in the population. In the past year, the population of the Soviet Union increased by 3,660,000 and at the beginning of 1960 stood at more than 212 million. (*Applause.*)

The whole world pays tribute to the Soviet Union's outstanding achievements in public education and the promotion of science and culture. Last year's census produced some very indicative figures: we have 13,400,000 people with higher, incomplete higher and specialised secondary education, and 45,300,000 graduates of ten-year and seven-year secondary schools. In 1939 the proportion of persons with higher education was 6 per 1,000 and those with secondary education 77 per 1,000. In 1959 the figures were respectively 18 and 263. It is gratifying to know that women make 49 per cent of the higher education and 53 per cent of the secondary education groups. (*Applause.*)

There has been a considerable increase in higher and secondary school graduates in the formerly backward republics. For example, in the Uzbek Republic, the number of persons with higher education rose in the past twenty years from 3 to 13 per 1,000 of the population, and the number of persons with secondary education from 39 to 234. In the Kazakh Republic the increase has been from 5 to 12 and 60 to 239; in the Tajik Republic—from 2 to 10 and 27 to 214; in the Turkmen Republic—from 3 to 13 and 46 to 256; in the Azerbaijan Republic—from 7 to 21 and 73 to 264; in the Byelorussian Republic—from 4 to 12 and 67 to 225. These figures furnish a graphic picture of cultural advancement, of the training of national cadres in the Soviet Socialist Republics and of the triumph of our Leninist national policy. (*Applause.*)

The Communist Party and the Soviet Government devote much attention to the training of highly-skilled personnel for work in all fields of the economy, science and culture. The student body of our higher educational institutions is

now nearly four times that of Britain, France, the German Federal Republic and Italy taken together. The U.S.S.R. has long since overtaken the United States in the training of engineers; in 1958 we graduated 94,000 engineers to America's 35,000. Our scientific research establishments have an aggregate staff of over 300,000, or thirty times more than in pre-revolutionary Russia.

Socialism has opened to the people the path to education and culture, and this is one of its greatest advantages over capitalism. Our comprehensive system of free education from primary school to university, possible only under socialism, represents an excellent base for technical progress and the flourishing of science, whose achievements inspire legitimate pride in our people. (*Applause.*)

The year 1959 will be remembered for the great achievements of our scientists, which have won world-wide recognition. Our scientists blazed the trail to outer space and to the disclosure of its secrets for the benefit of all mankind. Last year a Soviet lunar rocket became the first artificial planet of the solar system. The second Soviet lunar rocket reached the surface of our nearest celestial neighbour—a feat unparalleled in the annals of history—and carried to the Moon the Soviet National Emblem. (*Applause.*) The third Soviet rocket photographed the reverse side of the Moon, invisible from the Earth. These achievements usher in a new era in world science and technology. (*Applause.*)

Last year saw the commissioning of the world's first atomic-powered icebreaker, the *Lenin*. It will provide extensive opportunities for year-round Arctic navigation. World opinion regards the *Lenin*, and also our atomic power plants and the use of radioactive elements in medicine, as striking examples of how the Soviet Union applies nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

The Soviet people worked hard to build up their first-class industry, the foundation of our national economic structure. And to do that they often denied themselves even bare essentials, were undaunted by difficulties and unsparing of effort. One of Russia's talented poets, Valery Bryusov, wrote: "Work till the hot sweat runs, work without stinting time or effort, for happiness comes only through work." That is just how the Soviet people have worked. And now everyone can see the magnificent fruits this heroic la-

bour has brought forth. Our country now possesses a powerful industrial and technical base, excellent scientists, technicians and highly-skilled workers for developing every type of modern industry, equipped with the most advanced technical facilities.

The Soviet Union pioneered in the construction of atomic power plants for civilian purposes and continues its progress in this field. Our successes in intercontinental civilian aircraft are universally known. In recent months Soviet pilots set several new world speed and altitude records. We are several years ahead of other countries in the design and mass production of intercontinental ballistic rockets of different types. Electronics and complex computing and programme machines have acquired vast importance in our time, and we can record significant achievements in this field. We have created extensive facilities for continued and rapid progress in this highly-important realm of modern technology.

The task set by the Party of accelerating technical progress in every branch of the economy is being accomplished, with the result that application of straight-flow production methods has been considerably extended in industry and building, and a higher level of mechanisation achieved, particularly in heavy and labour-consuming processes. Many operations in industry, construction and the transport services are being automated, and this is being done on an ever wider scale. We now have everything needed to pass, in practice, from automation of individual operations to automation of technological processes, whole shops and factories and, in time, to all-round automated production and automated control in industry.

In the capitalist countries, automation means more unemployment and, hence, more hardship and misery for the worker. In a socialist economy, automation means new and limitless opportunities for heightening the productivity of social labour and increasing the national wealth and, at the same time, immensely lightening labour and shortening the workday.

The Soviet Union's swift economic and technological advancement can no longer be challenged even by socialism's diehard enemies. Even they cannot now deny that we have outstanding achievements in economic, scientific and technological development.

Our industrial and agricultural indices for the past few years show that the goal set by the Party—to overtake and surpass the United States in per capita output—is being successfully attained.

Here are comparative data on 1959 industrial output in the U.S.S.R. and U.S.A., showing gains or declines from 1953.

	U.S.S.R.	U.S.A.
Total industrial output	90% increase	11% increase
Per capita output	71% increase	0.3% increase
Pig iron	57% increase	16% decline
Steel	57% increase	16% decline
Coal	58% increase	12% decline
Oil	145% increase	9% increase
Electric power	97% increase	56% increase
Cement	143% increase	24% increase

The figures show that in the past six years, as throughout all the years of Soviet power, our industrial expansion has been at an appreciably faster pace than in the United States. (*Prolonged applause.*)

As noted at the December Plenum of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee, the Soviet Union has made big gains in agriculture. The fact is highly significant that in 1959 we produced more butter, on a per capita basis, than the United States. For the second year now we are ahead of the United States in total milk output. As for meat, though we have advanced considerably in the past several years we are still producing 58 per cent less meat per capita than the United States. Last year's progress in livestock farming, larger fodder resources, and the socialist obligations assumed by our farmers make it certain that in meat production, too, we shall catch up with the United States in a few years' time.

These splendid results of the opening year of the seven-year plan are due primarily to our heroic working class, collective farmers and Soviet intellectuals. It is they who build our new factories and mills, homes and schools,

set in motion the powerful technical resources, produce our coal, oil and steel, design and build excellent machines, raise big harvests, increase output of animal products, and blaze new paths in science and technology. The exhilarating vistas opened up by the decisions of the Twenty-First Party Congress inspire our working people to new achievement. (*Applause.*)

The socialist emulation drive for pre-schedule fulfilment of the seven-year plan has spread to all our factories, mills, mines, construction projects, collective and state farms in all the Economic Regions. And this emulation drive has brought to the fore thousands of splendid initiators of advanced production methods and organisers of Communist Work Teams.

Guided by the decisions of the Twenty-First Congress, the Party and the Government are consistently effectuating measures for the further development of socialist democracy, drawing the widest masses of the working people into the administration of the country's political, economic and cultural affairs. Extension of the rights of Union Republics, local authorities and public organisations, and reorganisation of industrial management have produced valuable results. The activity of the masses, politically and on the labour front, is growing and their creative initiative developing.

More and more government functions are being entrusted to public organisations, and they are playing a bigger part in economic and cultural development and in strengthening socialist law and order. One evidence of this is the recent decision of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers and the Party Central Committee to abolish the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Internal Affairs and transfer its functions to the Republics and local authorities. (*Applause.*) This was done not only to reduce the size and cost of our administrative apparatus, but chiefly to further develop socialist democracy and enhance the role of public organisations in combating infringement of our laws, and to extend the powers of local authorities.

The creative initiative, the great labour enthusiasm of the working class, collective farmers and Soviet intellectuals are a sure earnest that the majestic goals of the seven-year plan will be reached ahead of the appointed time. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The Soviet Union's high rate of economic growth is no longer questioned anywhere in the world. The only dispute is how much faster we are moving ahead than the United States and how long will it take us to catch up with it. The question is being debated in America by many prominent economists, business leaders and statesmen.

Allen Dulles, director of the United States Central Intelligence Agency, recently declared that "the U.S.S.R. will achieve significant gains by 1965 in its self-appointed task of catching up with the United States, particularly in industrial production." Discussing the position in the socialist countries, Dulles said: "We should frankly face up to the very sobering implications of the Soviet economic programme and the striking progress they have made over the last decade."

Towards the end of 1959, the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee published a study prepared by the Corporation for Economic and Industrial Research. It says that "by 1970 the U.S.S.R. is likely to be a formidable industrial nation, relatively stronger than at present, and, in certain sectors, larger than the United States". Not a bad testimonial!

These statements, coming as they do from people whom no one will suspect of exaggerating our achievements and potentialities, are added proof of our rapid and successful economic progress. And we are firmly convinced that in the peaceful economic competition of the two systems, the more progressive and virile socialist system will emerge victorious. (*Loud applause.*)

The Twenty-First Congress of the C.P.S.U. heralded our entry into the period of full-scale building of communist society. The seven-year plan approved by the congress is the first stage of this historic period. We are now in a position to work out in greater detail a long-range economic development plan for 15-20 years. It will, at the same time, be a programme for consummating the historic task set by the great Lenin—electrification of the entire country. This long-range plan will become the axis of the Party's programme of full-scale building of communist society.

The Soviet people are confident that 1960, the second year of the seven-year plan, will bring new outstanding victories in the building of communism. (*Prolonged applause.*)

## SOME QUESTIONS OF THE PRESENT INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

Comrade Deputies, we have noted more than once that the international situation has definitely improved of late. You all remember, of course, what the international situation was like several years ago—say, in 1952-1953. Comparing the situation in those years with what we have today, we can draw only one conclusion—the clouds of the war menace have begun to disperse, though not as fast as we should have liked.

To be sure, it would be wrong to picture the recent course of events as a sort of straight line, starting somewhere at a rather high point of international tension and dropping to ever lower points. If it were possible to gauge the degree of international tension in the same way as, say, temperature is measured—with a mercury column—the thermometer would show us several drops and rises. But the general tendency is that international tensions are beginning to relax and the “cold war” champions are suffering defeat.

The Jubilee Session of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet, held on the 40th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, advanced a proposal for an East-West conference of leaders to ease international tension. We note with pleasure that the efforts of the Soviet Government to bring about such a meeting have yielded positive results.

Not long ago we reached agreement with Dwight Eisenhower, the U.S. President, Charles de Gaulle, the French President, and Harold Macmillan, the British Prime Minister, to hold a Summit conference in Paris on May 16. It is understood that this conference will be followed by a number of further top-level meetings.

It would be imprudent to try to forecast the possible results of the forthcoming conference, since those results will depend not only on us, but also on our partners. It is important to stress, however, that there are to be serious talks with the leaders of the major Western Powers with a view to reaching a mutual understanding on the more pressing international issues and eliminating the causes of international tension. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, we should like the meeting to be beneficial and fruitful.

We are deeply convinced that, given reasonable consideration for the interests of the parties concerned and general readiness to meet each other half-way, any controversial question, however thorny and complicated, can be settled to mutual advantage and in the interest of peace. And there are any number of issues of this kind awaiting settlement. To begin with, there are the issues of general and complete disarmament, of a peace treaty with Germany—including the question of making West Berlin a free city—of a ban on atomic and hydrogen weapons tests, and of East-West relations. It is first of all these issues that we have proposed placing on the agenda of the coming Summit meeting.

It is only natural that the people everywhere should pin great hopes on the meeting in question for the strengthening of peace and friendly co-operation among the nations. True, isolated voices can be heard, particularly in some small countries, expressing apprehension that the Great Powers, having reached agreement among themselves, may throw the interests of small countries overboard, ignoring the views of the states not represented at the conference. Permit me to state here that these apprehensions are absolutely groundless. As far as the Soviet Government is concerned, it has never had and does not have any intention of reaching agreement behind the backs of other countries on matters directly affecting their interests. We consider that any attempts to derive unilateral benefits of any kind at the expense of other countries would be altogether at variance with the aims of the planned meeting, whose results should benefit universal peace and, consequently, all countries, big and small.

The meetings, and the frank and very useful talks, which took place between President Eisenhower and myself at Camp David, as also those I had with Prime Minister Macmillan of Great Britain during his stay in Moscow early last year, suggest that a spirit of realism, frankness and co-operation will prevail at the coming Summit talks as well. Recent experience is conclusive proof that personal meetings and contacts between the leading statesmen are, in the circumstances, the most effective and promising method of improving relations between states and reaching agreement on outstanding international issues.



In two months from now I am to visit France at the invitation of President de Gaulle. It will be a great pleasure for us to acquaint ourselves with the life and achievements of the great French people, our ally in the common struggle against Hitler fascism. In the course of history, a feeling of affection has developed in our country for France and her people, who have made so important a contribution to world culture, science and technology. It is fair to hope that my forthcoming visit to France and talks with President de Gaulle will produce positive results both in the way of improving Soviet-French relations and in achieving a healthier international atmosphere. In our country, General de Gaulle is known as a man who showed great courage in the days when France had been defeated and was occupied by Hitler troops. Many statesmen at that time betrayed the interests of France and began to collaborate with the invaders. In those difficult years General de Gaulle fought for the liberation of France from the tyranny of the invaders and for her national honour.

Much can be expected from the forthcoming meeting with President Eisenhower, who is coming on a return visit to our country in June. The Soviet Government hopes that the noble cause of bringing an atmosphere of trust into Soviet-American relations, to which we devoted our efforts at Camp David, will be fruitfully continued in Moscow. *(Applause.)*

After this session of the Supreme Soviet, K. Y. Voroshilov, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., will leave for India on a goodwill visit at the invitation of the President of the Republic. At the same time F. R. Kozlov, First Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., and Y. A. Furtseva, Deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., will go on a visit to India at the invitation of the Indian Government. The delegation has also received, and accepted with pleasure, a kind invitation from the King and Government of Nepal to visit that country.

We believe that these visits will help to strengthen friendly relations between the peoples of the Soviet Union and India and between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Nepal, and will promote world peace. *(Applause.)*

You know that I am shortly to visit Indonesia, where I am going at the invitation of Mr. Sukarno, the President and Prime Minister of the Republic of Indonesia.

We set great hopes on this trip because our two countries have many questions in common that unite us. These questions are the struggle for the further consolidation of peace, the struggle against colonial rule, and the further strengthening of the economic and political independence of the countries that have won their freedom and independence. *(Applause.)*

The Indian Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru, has invited us to visit India on our way to Indonesia. I have accepted the invitation with pleasure because we believe that meetings with Mr. Nehru and other Indian leaders will serve peace and promote friendly relations between our two countries. *(Applause.)* Good relations between the peoples of the Soviet Union and India are developing and growing stronger. I have very good personal relations with Mr. Nehru. The trip, new meetings and exchanges of views, will contribute to a durable world peace. *(Applause.)*

The Soviet Government has also received an invitation from His Majesty Zahir Shah, the King of Afghanistan, and from the Afghan Government to visit their country as well during the forthcoming trip. We have accepted with pleasure. I expect to make a stop in Kabul to exchange views with the King and the Government of our immediate neighbour, Afghanistan, with whom we have friendly relations that are making good progress. *(Applause.)*

There is an invitation from the Government of the Union of Burma to visit Burma during the trip to Indonesia. I shall be pleased to avail myself of the kind invitation to revisit that country. I think that my visit to Burma and an exchange of views with her government leaders will serve the progress of good relations between our two countries and promote peace. *(Applause.)*

We are also preparing to meet with the President of the Italian Republic, Sig. Gronchi, who will visit the Soviet Union in February. We hope that our meetings and conversations with the Italian President will help further to improve Italian-Soviet relations and bring our peoples closer together, which will also contribute to a durable peace. *(Applause.)*

In the international sphere, there have lately been tendencies favourable to a lessening of tension. On the other hand, it is evident that influential forces with whom both the thaw in international relations and personal contacts between the heads of state of the East and the West go against the grain are still active in the biggest countries of the West, above all the NATO countries. Thirst for profit urges certain imperialist quarters to continue the arms race and maintain the state of "cold war". These quarters are influential enough and can under certain conditions injure the effort for easing international tension.

Those politicians who have cast in their lot with the arms race policy dread a relaxation of world tension and cannot bear the very thought of relaxation becoming a reality.

There are, for example, the statements made by Governor of New York Rockefeller, the well-known American multi-millionaire, ex-President of the United States Truman and ex-Secretary of State Acheson. This trio, and indeed some other people, approach international issues from positions that are very far from those that found expression in the Soviet-American Communiqué released at Camp David. Statements of that sort are standard specimens of "cold war". They must to some extent be due to the fact that Truman is an ex-President and Acheson his ex-Secretary of State, and that both of these "ex's" find it impossible to renounce the old, now discredited policy "from positions of strength", the policy of "containment" and "rolling back", and of "brinkmanship". Other leaders who would like to gain influence in U.S. politics are trying to follow in Truman's and Acheson's footsteps. Yet it should be obvious to anyone that falling back on the "cold war" policy bodes no good.

The advocates of "cold war" test their voices, making speeches in one place and another. In their statements, they sing the old "cold war" tune, holding up the bugaboo of the "communist threat". But people who want peace have long been fed up with this false tune and are irritated by it.

The change in U.S. public sentiment came out, in particular, during Nelson Rockefeller's recent pre-election tour of the country. Speaking before the electorate, he tried, as it were, to counter the warmth that had set in in the international climate by intensifying the "cold war" draught,

to go back to the worst days, when tension between the states was very high. But what was the outcome? Even those Americans who usually listen to what multi-millionaires and "cold war" advocates such as Rockefeller have to say did not like the shrill note he struck.

Rockefeller was plainly eager to ride into the White House on the "cold war" horse and try out the presidential chair. But the horse began to stumble and Rockefeller realised that it would not get him there because it is not now the kind of horse that will bring you to the White House. He therefore announced beforehand his decision not to run for President. But that step may be no more than a manoeuvre.

It is certainly not a repudiation of the "cold war", not a desire to lay down arms and begin working for international co-operation. It is clear that the imperialists will try again to rally the forces of the "cold war" supporters. Peace-loving people must be on their guard, and must not relax their effort to strengthen peace. With still greater determination they must expose those who are intent on maintaining international tension and the arms race, who wish to further their personal prosperity and their careers through a policy that threatens mankind with terrible danger.

It is hard to believe that there is anyone in the United States who does not realise the disastrous consequences which a new world war would have. Neither millions, nor even billions of dollars can safeguard aggressors against defeat if they should start up a new war.

Those circles in the United States, and indeed in the other NATO countries, who today advocate the continuation of the "cold war", find themselves shackled by contradictions born of the "cold war" policy. On the one hand, these circles have an interest in the arms race because it brings them profits. On the other, they cannot but see that the arms race increases the danger of a war whose flames would devour all their fortunes, including the profits made from the arms race. Hence a number of contradictory phenomena in the policy of the capitalist countries, which alternately show a tendency to international co-operation and to an aggravation of international tensions.

One example of these contradictory tendencies is now furnished, unfortunately, by the stand which the U.S. Gov-

ernment has taken on the issue of discontinuing atomic and hydrogen weapons tests.

It is well known that for a rather long time—more than a year—the nuclear powers, that is, the Soviet Union, the United States and Britain, have been holding talks in Geneva to discontinue test explosions of atomic and hydrogen weapons. The importance of this problem is obvious to all. It would be unfair to deny that although the Geneva talks are making slow headway, they have, nevertheless, produced certain positive results facilitating the conclusion of an agreement to end tests.

That being so, the peoples of the world received as a good, encouraging omen the decision, taken of its own accord by each of the negotiating states, to refrain from further nuclear tests. For over a year, no test explosions of atomic or hydrogen weapons have been carried out anywhere in the world. This gratifying fact inspired the peoples with the hope that the existing situation could be made final through the earliest possible conclusion of an appropriate international treaty putting an end to nuclear tests once and for all.

But on December 29 last, Mr. Eisenhower, the U.S. President, made a statement which implied that the United States would consider itself free to resume nuclear weapons tests after December 31, 1959. And although the President's statement says that the United States will not resume tests without advance notice, it evidently means that the United States may now resume nuclear explosions at any time.

The announcement of this decision by the U.S. Government caused regret and alarm in every single country of the world.

It is easy enough to imagine what the consequences would be if any country were to resume nuclear weapons tests in the present situation. The other nuclear powers would be compelled to adopt the same course. An impetus would be given to the resumption of an absolutely unlimited race in the testing of nuclear weapons by any power and in any conditions. The government that resumed nuclear weapons tests first would assume a grave responsibility before the peoples.

It would be difficult to reconcile a decision by any one of the three powers to resume nuclear weapons tests with

the commitments made by it before all the members of the United Nations. For the recent session of the U.N. General Assembly, expressing the will of the peoples, unanimously called on the parties to the Geneva talks on the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests to exert still greater efforts for a speedy agreement and not to resume nuclear weapons tests. The delegations of the Soviet Union, the United States and Great Britain voted for this appeal.

I should like to re-emphasise in this connection that the Soviet Government, prompted by the desire to provide the most favourable conditions for the earliest possible drafting of a treaty on the discontinuance of tests, will abide by its commitment not to resume experimental nuclear blasts in the Soviet Union unless the Western Powers begin testing atomic and hydrogen weapons. (*Applause.*)

The statement made by the U.S. President says that the prospects for a test-ban agreement have been injured of late. I must frankly say that we find it hard to accept such an appraisal. I have already said that the three power conference has done a good deal to draft such an agreement. The Soviet Union recently submitted to the Geneva Conference new proposals for the solution of three problems on which there had been considerable disagreement—the composition of the Control Commission, the staffing of control posts and the procedure to be used by the Control Commission in deciding budgetary and financial matters. These Soviet proposals, which are a step towards meeting the Western Powers, offer an opportunity for further progress in the work of the Geneva Conference.

We note with satisfaction that part of President Eisenhower's statement saying that the United States will resume negotiations in a continuing spirit of seeking to reach an agreement ending nuclear weapons tests.

As regards the Soviet Union, it will continue to seek ways of surmounting the obstacles which have arisen in the course of the Geneva talks. It will make every effort to bring about the early conclusion of a treaty ending all nuclear weapons tests for all time. We believe that there are opportunities for this even now, if only all parties will strive for agreement.

Lately official U.S. spokesmen have claimed that underground blasts can be concealed so as to defy detection by

any instruments. Let us grant that modern technique sometimes fails to give absolute certainty that all underground nuclear weapons blasts will be detected. Let us grant that it is sometimes not so easy to distinguish underground nuclear explosions from earthquakes, or explosions of a volcanic nature. But if an appropriate agreement is signed, it will naturally have to be carried out in good faith by all sides. The peoples of the whole world will benefit immensely from this. All nuclear weapons blasts—underground, under water and in the air—will be ended. People will be certain that the atmosphere will not be contaminated by radioactive fallout. In the meantime progress in science will provide means of detecting and recording all nuclear blasts with absolute precision.

But even if today we do not yet have a guarantee that all blasts are recorded fully and with absolute accuracy, a test-ban agreement will place great obligations on its signatories. And it goes without saying that they will all have to adhere to it strictly. If a party violates its commitments, the initiators of the violation will cover themselves with disgrace, and will be branded by the peoples of the whole world.

As I have said, no nuclear explosions have been carried out for more than a year—in accordance with voluntary commitments made by each side, without an international agreement. Such an agreement, if it is signed, will presumably make it still more obligatory for all the countries concerned to abide strictly by the understanding reached.

Therefore, references to the imperfections of the technical methods of detecting nuclear blasts are not the best excuse for resuming underground nuclear blasts. If they want to resume tests of nuclear weapons in the air, on the ground, underground or under water, let them say so plainly instead of seeking formal pretexts to justify the step.

We wish to re-emphasise that the Soviet Union holds firmly to the view that all types of nuclear weapons tests in the air, on the ground, underground and under water must be discontinued. (*Applause.*) If a decision were adopted to ban tests only in the atmosphere, this would shatter the peoples' hopes of a complete discontinuance of tests. The peoples want complete disarmament and the disbandment of

lal armies. They want a complete ban on nuclear weapons, so that a lasting and dependable world peace will be assured. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Awareness of the fact that the international situation has changed and that a radical shift has occurred in the relation of forces between the socialist and the capitalist countries is gaining ground in the Western countries. It appears that the ossified notions of the nature and prospects of East-West relations, notions that took shape over the years, are right now undergoing a definite change in those countries, above all probably in the United States. This is the subject of numerous statements by statesmen and politicians. Special committees, such as those set up by the U.S. Senate, publish voluminous studies on the further course of Western foreign policy.

There are now many politicians in the West who have learned from experience that the old "position of strength" policy is untenable, but who have not yet come to recognise the need of a genuine policy of peace and honest co-operation with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. It is clear that the contradictory conclusions and inferences of certain Western circles stem from confusion in the face of the outstanding successes and achievements of the Soviet Union and the socialist camp as a whole.

While in the United States, we saw that the more farsighted of the American statesmen, businessmen and intellectuals, to say nothing of the workers and farmers, want peace and tranquillity, and not a continued arms race and nervous strain. Since the launching of the Soviet sputniks and space rockets, which demonstrated the possibilities of modern technology, the American people have become fully aware of the fact that the United States is now no less vulnerable militarily than any other country. I think no one will suspect me of trying to intimidate anyone by these words. This is simply the actual state of affairs and it is not we alone who see it that way, but also Western statesmen, including those of the United States. No matter to what U.S. audience we spoke of the need of peaceful co-existence and disarmament, our statements on these points always met with understanding and, moreover, brought what I would call a most favourable response and approval from the Americans.

Today popular sentiment in the United States, Britain, France, Italy and other countries is such that even those circles which are still clinging to a "cold war" policy are unable to come out openly against the idea of disarmament and peaceful coexistence. That is why, at this stage, they are adapting themselves to the situation, regrouping their forces, manoeuvring, and trying to camouflage themselves. But their positions have been undermined, and their strength is dwindling in the face of the peoples' irresistible urge for peace. Our task is to strike at the "cold war" supporters unrelentingly, hitting them harder and harder, so as to isolate them, and to pillory them in the eyes of world opinion. Our most effective weapon in this noble cause is the peace policy of the Soviet Government and its indefatigable effort towards ending the "cold war" for good. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Recent years have been rich in international events which led to the consolidation of the international position of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. We have every reason to say that never throughout the glorious history of the Soviet state has our country been so reliably safeguarded against any eventualities or encroachments from outside as it is now. (*Stormy applause.*) Never before has the Soviet Union's influence on international affairs, and its prestige as a bulwark of peace, been as great as it is today. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The alignment of forces in the international arena assures the superiority of the peace-loving states. Marching in the serried ranks of the countries championing peace are the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and the other socialist countries. Many countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America are taking more and more vigorous action to promote peace. (*Applause.*)

#### FOR GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT

Comrade Deputies, you know that at its Twentieth and Twenty-First Congresses our Party arrived at the conclusion that in the present situation there is no longer any fatal inevitability of war and that it is possible and necessary to banish war from the life of human society for all time.

General and complete disarmament is a clear path leading to the deliverance of mankind from the calamities of war.

On behalf of the Soviet Government, I submitted a programme for general and complete disarmament to the United Nations on September 18, 1959.

Our proposals are simple and clear to anyone. They are supported by all who strive to make the Second World War the last world war in human history, to prevent a third world war from ever breaking out. To prevent another war, we must destroy the means of warfare and put the states in conditions where none of them will be able to start hostilities against another state. This is precisely what the Soviet Government is proposing. Our proposals provide for the disbandment of all armed forces and the destruction of all types of weapons.

The Soviet Union is prepared itself and proposes to the other countries that they abolish war ministries and general staffs and do away with military service. To put it in a nutshell, the idea of our proposals is to reduce practically to zero the level of the armed forces and armaments of states, leaving them only strictly limited contingents agreed for each country, and equipped with small arms, for the maintenance of internal order and the protection of the personal safety of citizens.

We are satisfied with the fact that at the General Assembly all the U.N. member states adopted a resolution approving the idea of general and complete disarmament. The Ten Nation Committee which is shortly to begin discussing disarmament questions has been instructed to consider our proposals.

It should also be noted that our partners at the coming negotiations, on whom the results of the examination of the Soviet disarmament proposals will chiefly depend, lent an attentive ear to the Soviet proposals, although they added reservations to their positive statements, specifically with regard to establishing control. We are somewhat surprised at those reservations because our proposals provide for all that is needed to ensure reliable international control over the realisation of general and complete disarmament.

When our Government was drafting and discussing the proposals for general and complete disarmament, we were

familiar enough, of course, with the attitudes of our partners towards control. Therefore, this time too, we worked out with particular care the proposals for control to forestall possible objections and leave no room for reservations on the part of the Western Powers. Nevertheless, we again hear the same old groundless contentions to the effect that the Soviet proposals do not provide for effective enough control over the realisation of disarmament measures.

If our Western partners are really intent on ensuring effective control over disarmament, we welcome that, because it is what we want, too. The Soviet Union is for strict international control over disarmament. It advocates agreement on general and complete disarmament such as will provide a reliable guarantee that no country will violate its disarmament commitments. Our proposals envisage the establishment of effective international control over disarmament, which should naturally correspond to the specific stages of disarmament.

If, however, the Western Powers are making reservations on control by way of pettifogging, in order to delay and then wreck agreement on general and complete disarmament, that will certainly frustrate hopes for general and complete disarmament and is bound to be a bitter disappointment to the peoples.

There are those in the West who allege that disarmament is fraught with grave consequences for the economy of the capitalist countries. They argue that if the production of bombs, guns, submarines and other means of destruction were to be stopped, that would lead to ruin and to the loss of employment and means of subsistence by hundreds of thousands of people. But this sort of talk is fit only for people who can see no other way of developing the economy than by subordinating it to the interests of war preparations.

The least we can say about assertions of this kind is that they are utterly unsubstantiated. I had occasion to talk with many representatives of American business who take a far less gloomy view of the matter and are confident that U.S. industry is well able to cope with the task of converting the entire economy to the output of goods intended for peaceful uses.

Indeed, there is good reason to expect that the conversion of production capacities to the manufacture of peace-time

goods would make it possible to sharply reduce the taxes levied on the population, to increase the capacity of the home market and at the same time to spend more on education, health and social maintenance. And would it not increase to a tremendous extent the opportunities of a foreign trade free from the artificial restrictions prompted by considerations that have nothing to do with economic advantage? How many countries in the world need peace-time goods and not weapons!

There can be no doubt that, given disarmament, the opportunities of selling peace-time products in the foreign market would increase immensely and world trade would have excellent prospects of expansion.

It is not one particular state or group of states that would benefit from disarmament, for disarmament would pave the way to a lasting peace and to economic progress in all countries and for all peoples.

The Soviet Union has proved not only by words, but also by deeds, that it is seeking a solution to the disarmament problem. Immediately after the Second World War, a large-scale demobilisation of the armed forces was carried out in our country. In later years the Soviet Union dismantled all its military bases on foreign soil.

The Soviet Union went further still. Striving to put an end to the arms race and set about taking practical disarmament steps as soon as possible, our country effected a further reduction of its armed forces. It is well known that in the last four years the Soviet Union has unilaterally reduced the strength of its armed forces by a total of another 2,140,000. Soviet troops have been withdrawn from the Rumanian People's Republic and the strength of our troops stationed under existing agreements in the German Democratic Republic, the Polish People's Republic and the Hungarian People's Republic has been reduced considerably.

I should like to report to the Deputies to the Supreme Soviet on the changes that have occurred in the numerical strength of our armed forces over the past 30 odd years.

After the Civil War the Soviet Government demobilised the bulk of the armed forces and reorganised them. As a result, by 1927 we had 586,000 men serving in the Red Army and Navy. This was also determined to a degree by the international situation at that time.

The Japanese imperialist aggression in the Far East and the advent of fascism to power in Germany were the reason why we increased our armed forces, which by 1937 were 1,433,000 strong.

Then, with the outbreak of the Second World War, which exposed the Soviet Union to the immediate threat of attack by Hitler Germany, our armed forces were increased again, so that by 1941 they were 4,207,000 strong.

Hitler Germany's treacherous attack on the Soviet Union and the bloody four-year war that followed compelled us to increase the strength of our armed forces to 11,365,000 by May 1945.

As a result of the demobilisation carried out immediately after the war, by 1948 the strength of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. was down to 2,874,000. The Soviet Union undertook a substantial reduction of its armed forces in the hope that the Western Powers, too, would be guided by the idea of preserving peace and friendship and would strengthen the relations established between the countries of the anti-Hitler coalition. But our hopes were not realised. As a result of the formation of the aggressive NATO bloc in the West and in view of the atom bomb blackmail at a time when we had no such bomb yet, the Soviet Union had, with a view to strengthening its defence against the eventuality of provocation, to increase the strength of its troops, which in 1955 reached 5,763,000.

Subsequently, between 1955 and 1958, as I have already reported, we reduced our armed forces by 2,140,000, so that their present strength is 3,623,000.

These, then, are the data on the state of the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union over the past decades.

#### A NEW PROPOSAL FOR REDUCING THE ARMED FORCES OF THE SOVIET UNION

Comrade Deputies, today the Soviet Government is submitting to the Supreme Soviet a proposal for a further substantial reduction of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. As in the past, we consider it possible to effect this reduction unilaterally, and irrespective of the progress of disarmament discussions by the Ten Nation Committee or other international agencies.

The Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. is submitting for your consideration and approval a proposal for reducing our armed forces by another 1,200,000. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*) If this proposal is approved by the Supreme Soviet, our army and navy will be 2,423,000 strong. In other words, the strength of our armed forces will be below the level indicated in the proposals which the United States, Britain and France put forward during the discussion of the disarmament problem in 1956. Those proposals fixed the level of the armed forces of the U.S.S.R. and the United States at 2,500,000 each. We accepted that proposal and on more than one occasion advanced it ourselves—on the understanding, of course, that this would be only a first step in the reduction of armed forces. In particular, we mentioned this figure in the Soviet proposals submitted to the U.N. General Assembly in the autumn of 1956. More than three years have passed since, but no agreement has yet been reached on the matter. Now we propose reducing the armed forces to a still lower level and we do so of our own accord, without procrastination, without wasting time and effort and without the nervous strain occasioned by interminable disarmament disputes with our partners.

We are confident that the Deputies will thoroughly discuss the proposal submitted by the Government to this session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., and will appreciate the motives guiding the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government in the matter.

The security of his country, the safeguarding of the achievements of the Revolution and the successful building of communism in our country are the prime concern of every Soviet citizen, and all the more so of a Deputy to the Supreme Soviet—an elected representative of the people. That is why the very first question prompted by the proposals we have submitted is whether the defence potential of our country will still be adequate when the measure we are suggesting has been carried out. Why is it that, at a time when our ill-wishers have not yet discarded the very phrase "policy from positions of strength", we, instead of countering strength with strength, are, in fact, willing to reduce our army and navy and, consequently, expenditure on armaments? What is the reason? Are we not being somewhat careless with regard to the security of our country?

We have made a detailed and comprehensive study of the matter and consulted the military, the General Staff, and we reply without hesitation: Our defence will be quite adequate and we have taken everything into account realistically.

What is the evidence backing this realistic appraisal and warranting so momentous a decision? What is the evidence on the strength of which the Deputies can adopt this decision with firm conviction that it will not prejudice the defensive capacity of our country?

Our confidence in the soundness of the suggested measures is based on the fact that the Soviet Union is going through a period of unprecedented upsurge in the entire national economy. It is based on the unbreakable moral and political unity of Soviet society. Soviet scientists, engineers and workers have made it possible to equip our armed forces with weapons that were unknown to man—atomic, hydrogen, rocket and other modern weapons. It is our economic progress; and the achievements of our scientific and technical genius, that made it possible to reduce the armed forces. We are also taking into account the growth and consolidation of the mighty socialist camp, which is a reliable stronghold of peace.

Thanks to the triumph of the Leninist ideas, the construction of a socialist society and further progress in building communism, our country is now making headway in all spheres—economy, the living standards of the people, science, technology and culture. Drawing on these achievements, our scientists, engineers and workers engaged in the defence industry have created new modern weapons that are abreast of the latest developments in science and technology. This enables us to reduce the armed forces without detriment to the defence potential of the country.

Allow me, Comrade Deputies, to express on your behalf, and on behalf of the Soviet Government and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the most sincere gratitude to all scientists, engineers, technicians and workers, to all who have been giving all their knowledge and energy to promote the welfare of our country and increase its might. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

The Party, the Government and the entire Soviet people give their warm thanks to the scientists, engineers, technicians and workers to whose knowledge and effort we owe great

achievements in developing atomic and hydrogen weapons, rockets and all the other means that have made it possible to raise the defence potential of our country to so high a level, which in turn enables us now to undertake a further reduction of the armed forces. (*Applause.*)

The Soviet Union has stockpiled the necessary amount of atomic and hydrogen weapons. As long as no agreement has been reached to outlaw nuclear weapons, we are compelled to continue producing them. To be sure, we have to spend a good deal for this purpose. But for the time being we cannot fully renounce the production of nuclear weapons; such a decision should come as a result of agreement between the nuclear powers.

Our country has powerful rocketry. The present level of military technique being what it is, the air force and the navy have lost their former importance. These arms are being replaced and not reduced. Military aircraft is almost entirely being replaced by rockets. We have now drastically reduced, and apparently will reduce still further, or even discontinue, the production of bombers and other obsolete craft. In the navy, the submarine fleet is acquiring great importance, whereas surface ships can no longer play the role they played in the past.

Our armed forces have to a considerable degree been switched to rocket and nuclear weapons. We are perfecting, and will go on perfecting, these weapons—until they are banned.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government can inform you, Comrade Deputies, that the weapons we have now are formidable ones, but what is in the hatching, so to speak, is still more perfect, still more formidable. (*Stormy applause.*) The weapon that is being developed and is, as they say, in the portfolio of our scientists and designers is an incredible weapon.

You will all probably agree, Comrade Deputies, that today the question of the numerical strength of armed forces cannot be approached as it was approached but a few years ago. Suffice it to say that since 1955 the numerical strength of the armed forces in our country has been reduced by a third, but their fire-power has increased many times over during the period owing to the development and introduction of the latest types of modern military equipment.



In our time, a country's defensive capacity is not determined by the number of men under arms, of men in uniform. Apart from the general political and economic factors, of which I have already spoken, a country's defence potential depends in decisive measure on the fire-power and the means of delivery that country commands.

The proposed reduction will in no way reduce the fire-power of our armed forces, and this is the important thing. In fact, the reason why states maintain armies is to possess an adequate fire-power, such as will be able to stand up to a probable enemy and restrain him from attack; or repulse him effectively should he try to attack.

The Soviet Army today possesses such armaments and such fire-power as no army has ever had. I want to re-emphasise that we already have such an amount of nuclear weapons—atomic and hydrogen weapons and an appropriate number of rockets to deliver them to the territory of a potential aggressor—that if some madman were to provoke an attack on our country or on other socialist countries, we could literally wipe the country or countries attacking us off the face of the earth. (*Stormy applause.*)

It is perfectly clear to all sober-minded people that atomic and hydrogen weapons are particularly dangerous to the countries that are densely populated. Of course, all countries will suffer in one way or another in the event of a new world war. We, too, shall suffer much, shall sustain great losses, but we shall survive. Our territory is immense and our population is less concentrated in large industrial centres than is the case in many other countries. The West will suffer incomparably more. If the aggressors start up a new war, it will be not only their last war, but also the end of capitalism, for the peoples will see clearly that capitalism is a source of wars, and will no longer tolerate that system, which brings suffering and calamities to mankind. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Considering all this, the Soviet people can be confident and calm—the Soviet Army's present armament makes our country quite invulnerable. (*Stormy applause.*)

Of course, invulnerability is a rather relative term. After all, we must not forget that our enemies—for some states avow themselves to be our enemies, making no secret of their military and political aims—will not mark time.

If they do not yet have as many rockets as we have, and if their rockets are less perfect, they have a chance to overcome their temporary lag, to improve their rocketry, and will perhaps draw level with us sooner or later.

The United States, for instance, has set out to overtake the Soviet Union in rocket production within five years. It will certainly do its utmost to help its rocketry out of its present state and raise it to a higher level. But it would be naïve to imagine that we will meanwhile sit back and relax. Indeed, the Americans themselves are saying: Why, are the Russians going to play dice and wait for us?

Naturally, we will do everything to use the time we have gained in the development of rocket weapons and to keep our lead in this field until an international agreement on disarmament is reached. (*Prolonged applause.*)

But a question suggests itself here. Since the possibility must not be ruled out that some capitalist countries will draw level with us in modern armaments, cannot they commit treachery and attack us first in order to exploit the factor of a surprise attack by so formidable a weapon as atomic rockets and thereby secure advantages that may help them win? No. Modern means of warfare give no such advantages to either side.

It is possible to attack first. That wouldn't require much brains—it would rather require recklessness, and we realise, of course, that some of our probable enemies are prone to this sort of thing. It is not an infrequent occurrence that the advocates of the policy "from positions of strength" become hot-headed and reckless in one country or another, although it would seem that Hitler's "laurels" should have a cooling effect on them. But, apparently, their minds are so befogged that they have forgotten those serious lessons of history.

Let us suppose, however, that some state or group of states were to succeed in preparing and carrying out a surprise attack on a power possessing nuclear and rocket arms. Would the aggressor—even allowing for a moment that he succeeded in striking a surprise blow—be able to put out of action at once all the stocks of nuclear weapons, all the rocket installations on the territory of the power attacked? Of course not. The state subjected to a surprise attack—provided it

is a big state, of course—would in any case be able to rebuff the aggressor effectively.

We are aware that our country is surrounded by foreign military bases. We therefore distribute our rocket installations in such a way as to have a double and even treble reserve. Ours is a vast territory and we are in a position to disperse our rocket installations and to camouflage them well. We are developing such a system that if some means of retaliation are knocked out, we shall always be able to resort to the duplicating means and hit the targets from reserve positions. (*Applause.*)

That should be quite enough to have a sobering effect on anyone with a normal mentality, on people who are prepared to answer for their actions to the peoples and who hold the destinies of the peoples dear. There is no vouching for madmen, of course. Madmen have always existed and will probably not become extinct in the future, either. The only thing is not to forget that whereas in the past the advent of such madmen to power resulted in bloody wars, it would in our day be a calamity defying comparison.

Just as a mother sees to it when going out that no inflammable material, no matches or electric appliances are left within the reach of a child who may without knowing it cause great damage to the house and the city, so the peoples should see to it that the governments, parliaments and other offices on which the safeguarding of peace depends should not be infiltrated by people who set themselves insane, criminal aims. The peoples must show great vigilance to prevent madmen from using rocket and nuclear weapons against mankind, until a solution is found to the problem of general and complete disarmament and, consequently, of the destruction of all means of warfare. (*Prolonged applause.*)

#### THE LESSONS OF THE PAST MUST NOT BE FORGOTTEN

Western leaders have not yet renounced the policy "from positions of strength" and "on the brink of war". Although the principal champion of that policy is dead, his warlike calls have not yet been scrapped, have not been cast aside. Chancellor Adenauer is particularly active in this respect. But Herr Adenauer and those who like to repeat with him

that they will continue the policy "from positions of strength" should take a realistic view of things. They should look "under the roots", as Kozma Prutkov used to say. (*Animation.*)

There was some sort of logic in that policy when the Western Powers had economic superiority and the monopoly of a powerful weapon like the atom bomb, although, even then, that was no reason for pursuing a policy "from positions of strength".

Today, however, when the Soviet Union has atomic and hydrogen weapons, when our country has demonstrated to the world its superiority in rocket engineering, when the economy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries is flourishing, when the solid unity of the socialist camp is a reality and when all peoples are striving to join efforts to ensure peace, the policy "from positions of strength" is becoming utterly pointless.

What does it mean to bank on the policy "from positions of strength" now that the relation of forces has changed? It means to foredoom oneself to inevitable failure, to follow in Hitler's footsteps.

For it was Hitler who pursued the policy "from positions of strength" in its naked form. When he came to power he immediately started on a policy of expansion, a policy of winning so-called *Lebensraum*. He announced that he would make war on the Soviet Union and advance as far as the Urals, that he would subdue other countries.

The events which preceded the Second World War are still fresh in everyone's memory. Hitler cynically told those of like mind: "We must cast aside all sentimentality and be hard. Some day, when I order war, I shall not hesitate to send the ten million young men to their death." Hitler regarded the other nations and peoples as fertiliser and slaves for the chosen Aryan race which must rule all.

To disguise these criminal aims, Hitler called his party National-Socialist. The nazi leader adopted the term "socialism", which is the most popular with the peoples, in order to win over as many naïve and inexperienced people as possible.

In implementing his policy of conquest, Hitler presented ultimatums, and began hostilities if they were rejected. In that manner, he succeeded in overrunning many European countries. Intoxicated by easy victories, Hitler made a

gangster-like attack on the Soviet Union. Everyone knows how the adventure ended. It ended with that madman finding the right solution, for, when Soviet troops were already fighting in the streets of Berlin, he killed himself as a scorpion does when ringed by fire.

It should be borne in mind that on the eve of the Second World War the Soviet Union was the only socialist state, a state in a capitalist encirclement. At that time it was not we who had superiority in economy and in other resources. Today the situation is entirely different. Anyone who is in his right mind and has some little ability of calculating, reflecting, and understanding the developments which have taken place during the post-war period, is bound to see a radical change in the international relation of forces in favour of socialism. It should be obvious that to pursue a policy "from positions of strength" with regard to the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries today is to take the road of fatal adventures. (*Applause.*)

This adventurist policy today finds its most striking expression in West Germany. It will be recalled that one of Hitler's first reactionary steps after seizing power was to ban the Communist Party and to persecute working-class organisations. Adenauer, too, has outlawed the Communist Party of Germany and launched an offensive against the trade unions and other democratic organisations of the working people. One disgraceful trial after another is held in West Germany against persons active in the peace movement. Isn't that the limit? To put people behind prison bars merely because they advocate peace in accordance with their convictions is an arbitrary and lawless act even under the West German Constitution.

Lately there has been an increasingly distinct tendency in West Germany to whitewash and all but exonerate the bloody Hitler regime. This tendency was pointed out in apt terms by Lord Russell. In a letter to the *Times*, he called attention to the fact that the secondary school history books published in the Federal Republic of Germany in 1958, unlike those published in 1949, say nothing about the Reichstag fire, the persecution of the Jewish population, the atrocities perpetrated in concentration camps, and other crimes of the fascist regime of Hitler.

In his letter, Russell cited specific facts borrowed from the German newspaper *Die Welt*. For example, the textbook of German history published in 1949 devoted two and a half pages to the Reichstag fire staged by the nazis, whereas the 1958 textbook says not a word about it. The old textbook had three pages about the persecution of Jews, but the new one gives only 14 lines. Concentration camps were given five pages in the old textbook, but the new one says nothing at all about them.

The recent anti-semitic fascist actions in West German towns are a typical sign of growing reaction, whose diverse intrigues have long been well known to world public opinion. Many decades ago, when reaction was rampant in tsarist Russia, the "black hundreds" organised anti-semitic pogroms more than once. Lenin and the Bolsheviks, and all progressive people in general, vigorously combated that shameful practice.

In Germany, Hitler did his best to kindle anti-semitism. He suppressed all freedom and trampled the democratic rights underfoot. He did all that to be able to start on his bloody enterprise, that is, to unleash a war.

The Soviet Union has always championed, as it does today, friendship among all peoples, and friendship with the German people. We have very good, friendly relations with the German Democratic Republic, and we treasure this friendship. We are doing everything to have good, friendly relations with the West Germans as well. But we are greatly disappointed by the activities of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, particularly those of Chancellor Adenauer, aimed at fanning the "cold war".

We have heard Herr Adenauer's protestations to the effect that he is not a revanchist and would not tolerate a single revanchist minister in his cabinet. The German people indeed do not want to have anything in common with revanchists. But how are we to reconcile Chancellor Adenauer's statements with the fact that the West German Government is seeking a revision of the state boundaries established in Europe after the Second World War and rises up in arms against any suggestion for eliminating the survivors of that war, signing a peace treaty with Germany and establishing a durable peace in Europe?

Or take Adenauer's latest trip to West Berlin and his provocative statement that nothing would be left of the Soviet Union if it came to an atomic war. These facts suggest that Adenauer has not learned the lessons taught to the German fascists, and is taking the road they followed. We may well presume that Hitler's final "laurels" cannot tempt Adenauer.

We must state most unequivocally that if rabid fascists, such as are now being allowed to assume authority and command, build up the Bundeswehr and command the NATO armed forces, were to gain the upper hand in West Germany, and if those vermin tried to crawl out of their confines, far from being allowed to crawl as far as Moscow or Stalingrad, as they did during the Hitler invasion, they would be crushed on their own soil. (*Stormy, prolonged applause.*)

The policy of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany shows most dangerous trends. Unless checked by the forces of peace, these trends may have most deplorable consequences and may lead to a third world war.

We cannot help wondering why the war preparations of the Federal Republic of Germany are meeting with support on the part of France, Britain and other countries that suffered from Hitler's onslaught. How can those countries encourage West Germany to rearm, help her with their own hands to build up her armed forces and equip them with modern weapons?

Some politicians of West Germany's NATO allies say frankly and plainly, though they do so behind the scenes and not in public: Please believe us and try to understand that if the Federal Republic of Germany stays out of NATO, if it has no army and spends nothing on armaments, it will have great economic advantages over the other Western countries and will become a still more formidable competitor in trade. The West German economy is strong and it is ahead of those of the other NATO countries, except the United States. It follows that, to such Western politicians, economic progress in West Germany on peaceful lines is a very dangerous thing, while the entry of the Federal Republic of Germany into NATO and its participation in the arms race is almost a blessing. They are not averse to handicapping their West German rival with the burden of arms and

large armed forces so as to weaken West Germany economically and create more favourable conditions for competing with her in the world market.

The proponents of this most peculiar concept seem to forget that the arms they are giving to the German revanchists will not be used as the givers see fit. For the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, while accepting the weapons, has its own aims in view. It wants, with the aid of the army and a powerful economy, to win a dominant position in Western Europe and give orders to its NATO allies. In point of fact, it is not so far away from this goal. West Germany already holds many key positions in NATO.

French, British, Belgian and other NATO soldiers now have to take orders from the West German general Speidel. Yet the French know that general as an officer who was Hitler's close associate, who organised a fifth column among the French officers and afterwards became Chief of Staff of the Nazi forces that occupied France in 1940. As for the British, they know him as one of the organisers of Hitler's terroristic bombing raids on Britain. And now here is this Nazi, who got away with murder, commanding the NATO ground forces in Central Europe.

There was a time when, to justify West Germany's entry into NATO, the governments of the three Western Powers averred that the Paris Agreements would safeguard the European countries against a resurgent West Germany. In November 1955, John Foster Dulles, the late U.S. Secretary of State, said at the Geneva Foreign Ministers Conference:

"Is it objectionable that the Federal Republic of Germany foregoes the right to have atomic weapons, bacteriological weapons and chemical weapons? Is this objectionable that under the Brussels Treaty the military establishments and armaments of the Federal Republic are subject to investigations and control through the Brussels Treaty Council representing predominantly states which in the past have suffered from German aggression?"

That is what was said, but what happened in reality? It was claimed that West Germany's entry into NATO would make it possible to control her military economy and armaments, but in reality a situation was created in which West Germany is enabled to control her European allies and is

striving to exert pressure on the trend of U.S. policy. And what is actually left of the few restrictions originally imposed on West Germany by the Paris Agreements since today the Bundeswehr is receiving atomic and rocket weapons? All that the makers of the Brussels and Paris Agreements can now do is to seek comfort in the dead paragraphs of those agreements nullified by the West German militarists' revanchist policy.

See what Chancellor Adenauer calls for in his article published on New Year's Eve. Traditionally, on that day statesmen convey messages of peace and best wishes for prosperity to the peoples. Not so Adenauer. He goes on bending his energies to continue the policy "from positions of strength" and calling for "firmness and resolve" in pursuing that policy. The recent lessening of international tension is no more, as he sees it, than an "illusion". The Chancellor says that it is now "more essential than ever" to keep on increasing the military strength of NATO and West Germany.

These facts, comrades, go to show again how pressing is the problem of concluding a peace treaty with both German states, whose solution has long been urged by the Soviet Government. Such a treaty would write *finis* to the Second World War for good, assure the peaceful and democratic development of the whole of Germany and make her neighbours confident that West Germany will not revert to the road of aggression. The Soviet Government holds a peaceful settlement with Germany to be an international problem whose solution brooks no delay, a problem of the utmost importance.

We will do all in our power to have this problem settled at last. It is our earnest desire to find a solution to the German problem in common with our allies in the struggle against Hitler Germany. We proceed on the understanding that the question of West Berlin will also be settled thereby through agreement. But if all our efforts towards concluding a peace treaty with the two German states are still not crowned with success, the Soviet Union, together with the other countries that are willing to do so, will sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic, with all the attendant consequences. (*Prolonged applause.*)

## PEACEFUL OBJECTIVES OF THE SOVIET PROPOSALS

Comrade Deputies, some of the Soviet citizens, as well as our friends, the peace supporters in other countries, may perhaps wonder whether the new big reduction of the Soviet Armed Forces will not stimulate activity on the part of the military alignments opposing us. The United States will have larger armed forces than the Soviet Union. If the Federal Republic of Germany has nine divisions today, it is going to have as many as 12 divisions before long. The NATO military command has about 50 divisions at its disposal in Europe alone. Besides, the European countries in the North Atlantic alliance have over 30 divisions under their national control.

That being so, will not the reduction of the Soviet Army expose our country, and indeed the cause of peace, to danger? Will it not tempt the aggressive forces, the enemies of communism, to begin a war against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and thereby plunge mankind into a new carnage? Will it not undermine or lead to the loss of the Soviet "deterrent", to use the current Western term?

We have considered that and can report to the Supreme Soviet that the defence potential of our country will not diminish in the least. In present-day conditions, wars would not be waged the way they were before. They would have little in common with the wars of the past. In the old days the nations tried to keep their armies close to the frontiers so as to raise a living wall, as it were, of soldiers and guns at the right moment. If any country wanted to invade another, it had to attack the troops stationed thus on the border. That was how wars used to begin. At first fighting broke out on the frontiers of the belligerents and that is where the troops were massed.

If a war were to start now, hostilities would take a different course since the nations would have means of delivering their arms to points thousands of kilometres away. It is first of all deep in the belligerents' territory that a war would start. Furthermore, there would be not a single capital, no large industrial or administrative centre, and no strategic area left unattacked in the very first minutes, let alone days, of the war. In other words, the war would

start in a different manner, if at all, and would proceed in a different manner.

A reduction of the numerical strength of our armed forces will not prevent us from maintaining the country's defensive capacity at the proper level. We shall still have all the means required for the defence of our country, and our enemy will know it very well. In case he does not, we are warning him and telling him outright: By reducing the numerical strength of our armed forces, we shall not be diminishing their fire-power. On the contrary, their fire-power will increase many times over in terms of quality. (*Stormy applause.*)

If our Western partners decline to follow our example, they will disappoint not only progressive people, but all nations as well. If the Western Powers persist, they will thereby reveal their aggressiveness and their desire to continue the arms race and preparations for a new war. By their policy of arms race, they will be exposing themselves still more in the eyes of the peoples.

Economically, this policy will overload the budgets of the capitalist states and lead to an increasing tax burden.

It goes without saying that we shall have to spend a certain amount on defence, pending agreement on general and complete disarmament. But this expenditure will be cut down as the armed forces will have been reduced. Besides, this money will be used more effectively. Obviously, such a situation will benefit our country as it will help us to increase our economic power and to provide additional opportunities of promoting the standard of living, increasing our material wealth, building more homes and reducing the working day. It follows that the large armies in the countries of the military alignment opposing us are our involuntary allies who will make it easier for us to achieve our main objective, that is, to surpass the most developed capitalist countries in all fields—science, output of machinery and implements of labour, production of consumer goods, and meeting the requirements of the people. (*Applause.*)

I should like to comment on some speculations which are now rife abroad concerning our disarmament proposals and which our ill-wishers will in all probability indulge in

still more following the new, and so very impressive, reduction of the Soviet Armed Forces.

It is often alleged in the West that the Soviet Union wants disarmament because it is having difficulties in fulfilling its Seven-Year Economic Development Plan. They go so far as to assert that the Soviet Union put forward its disarmament proposals for the sole purpose of releasing funds to fulfil the Seven-Year Plan. Of course, that is nothing but an invention of the Soviet Union's ill-wishers. If there are those in the West who imagine that the state of the Soviet Union's economy does not permit of keeping an army strong enough to assure our country's defence, so much the worse for those who think so.

Our economy, as I have already reported, is making good progress and has reached an unprecedented level of prosperity. But we have a still brighter future in store, because we have fulfilled the programme for the first year of the Seven-Year Plan and, moreover, produced a large amount of goods over and above it. Consequently, far from having any difficulties, we have favourable conditions for a substantial overfulfilment of the Seven-Year Plan. The allegations about difficulties in fulfilling the Seven-Year Plan will therefore not hold water.

Some may interpret our proposals for a reduction of the armed forces as having been prompted exclusively by the necessity of saving and accumulating means. As you know, economy is always called for and is always of great practical importance. The lower the costs and the less unproductive spending, the more means can be allocated for reproducing the means of production, for developing the economy and hence for increasing output and meeting the material and spiritual needs of the people to a fuller extent.

The proposal for the reduction of the Soviet Armed Forces, which the Government is submitting to the Supreme Soviet, will save us approximately 16,000 million to 17,000 million rubles a year. It will be a very tangible saving for our people and country. It will help us very considerably in fulfilling and overfulfilling our economic plans. (*Applause.*)

To eliminate unproductive spending and provide additional opportunities for economic progress is a task constantly facing any country, not only ours. I repeat, economy is

always called for and the problem will always attract unflagging attention. However, the question of a nation's defence transcends the concept of cost, as indeed any other concept in terms of economy. We are no niggards and we shall not go chasing the rubles at the risk of imperilling the lives of our people and the very existence of our country.

It is not from economic or budgetary weakness but from strength and power that we are undertaking a reduction of the armed forces. In doing so, we are guided by the peaceful aspirations of our people. And it should be clear to anyone that if there arose a situation calling for more spending on the maintenance of the armed forces, our budget and our economy would permit of more than another ten thousand million rubles being set aside for the promotion of our country's security. (*Applause.*) If our country were threatened with immediate attack, we could not only keep our armed forces at their present strength, but could also increase them considerably. Our budget, our economy, would be able to bear the strain, and we could still provide sufficient investments to fulfil the Seven-Year Plan.

What is it, then, that now prompts us to propose reducing our armed forces? We are prompted by the lofty humanistic ideals which are inherent in our progressive world outlook and which completely permeate the life of a socialist society. It is not from positions of strength but from positions of reason that we approach the matter. (*Applause.*)

The reason why we are reducing our armed forces is that we want no war, do not intend to attack anyone, do not wish to threaten anyone and have no predatory aims. Today, inflated armies, as well as military bases thrust far beyond national frontiers, are meant for attack and are unnecessary for defence. By reducing the strength of our armed forces, we show that the intentions of our country are most peaceable and not aggressive. For no country planning to attack another country or group of countries would undertake a unilateral reduction of its armed forces since, to launch the attack, it would not only have to use its fire-power, including nuclear weapons and rockets, but would also have to increase the numerical strength of its army.

Comrade Deputies, we are about to decide a matter of great historic importance—a reduction of our armed forces—

and thereby to pave the way to a further relaxation of international tension, to a durable world peace. This action will rouse an echo in the hearts of the people in all countries. Not even the most inveterate exponents of the "cold war" will be able to prove that we are taking this step with a view to preparing for war.

Our people and the Communist Party express their deepest respect and affection for the soldiers, sailors, non-coms, officers, generals, admirals and marshals who have loyally served, and serve today, the interests of the Soviet people and the great ideals of Marxism-Leninism. The glory of our people's valiant sons and daughters, who shed their blood and gave their lives fighting for the freedom and independence of the country during the Civil War and the Great Patriotic War, will live on for ever. The Soviet people are deeply grateful to those who heroically repelled the enemy's onslaught and who worked with unstinting energy, and are working now, to increase their country's might as they stand guard over the peaceful labour of the Soviet people. (*Stormy applause.*)

The Soviet people will be most satisfied to learn of measures for a further reduction of the armed forces, which will result in a considerable number of servicemen resuming work in industry, at building sites, on collective and state farms, in research establishments and educational institutions.

Soviet and Party bodies will have a great deal of work to do in connection with the Government's proposal for so substantial a reduction of the armed forces, a proposal which, I am sure, will be unanimously approved by the Deputies. We expect that the implementation of this measure will require from twelve to eighteen months, or even two years. For there will be a large number of men to be discharged from military service. This should be done without undue haste, so as not to create any difficulties for them. Thorough preparation will be required to ensure that the men released as a result of demobilisation get jobs, that they obtain proper employment. The task will be easier in the case of the privates and non-coms. They have not served long and are skilled in specific trades which they will be able to take up again. Besides, they are young men who can easily learn the jobs that suit them.

It is a more responsible and difficult task to provide employment for officers and political workers, that is, professional army personnel. These men need most careful attention. The officers in our armed forces are well trained. They have devoted all their energies to studying military science and the art of war in order to serve our country well. Now they will have to learn new trades and professions and to use their knowledge in other fields, but it will be in the interest of the same common cause of achieving the triumph of the ideas of Lenin, the triumph of communism. (*Prolonged applause.*)

We must give them our care and affection so that they will feel at home in their new environment, in the new conditions in which they will be working. We must help them to acquire skills that will assure them an adequate income. Every one of them will be able to choose a job to his liking, for there are ample opportunities for that. At their new work places, they should be received as friends, as brothers, and treated with special consideration. They should be helped to acquire the knowledge they will need for making the best use of their energies in their new fields of activity, which will not be military but will be concerned with the fulfilment of the same tasks—increasing the might of our country, promoting economic and cultural progress and achieving the triumph of communism. (*Applause.*)

These men will be taking up jobs in the field of production, but if the situation calls for it, they will rejoin the ranks of the valiant Soviet Army to do their duty to the country.

The men and officers to be demobilised must be given time to get used to their new life. It might be advisable to set up special courses for them to acquire new skills. We shall be developing civil aviation and some of the air-men will be able to use their knowledge and experience as fliers. Some of the artillerymen and fliers will be used in new rocket units; many of them can be employed in the appropriate branches of the national economy.

It will be seen that the question is not one of simply giving an ex-serviceman a job, but of really seeing to it that he is not only well provided for, but also derives moral satisfaction from his work, being aware that he is serving

the common cause and taking an active part in communist construction. This is a big and complicated problem, and we should tackle it with the greatest sense of responsibility.

And now I want to discuss with you, Comrade Deputies, some ideas concerning the further improvement of our armed forces—that is, if there is no progress in solving the problem of general and complete disarmament. The Government and the Central Committee of our Party are now deliberating and studying the question of adopting, in due course, a territorial system of organisation of our armed forces. It may prove a repetition of what Vladimir Ilyich Lenin did in the early years of Soviet rule, but it will be in different conditions and in a somewhat different way. We believe that the territorial system will be able to provide the necessary personnel and contingents of population trained in the art of war and in the handling of modern weapons.

Looking ahead, we can visualise the possibility of our military units being formed on the territorial principle. The men will get their military training outside their working hours and, whenever necessary, appropriate means of transportation, such as aircraft and other military equipment, will make it possible to mass the forces in the appropriate area of our territory. I am saying this so that, in deciding on the present reduction of our armed forces, you also bear in mind the problems that may arise in the future, failing agreement on disarmament.

The Central Committee of our Party and the Soviet Government are confident that all our soldiers, and our officers, generals and admirals, who led the Soviet forces in battle with distinction in the years of the Great Patriotic War, will welcome the Soviet Government's proposal for a further substantial reduction of the Soviet Armed Forces. We are certain that the ex-servicemen who take up civilian jobs will serve their people as honourably in the field of peaceful labour as they have been doing in the ranks of the glorious Armed Forces of the Soviet Union. (*Prolonged applause.*)

We express our profound gratitude to these comrades for their loyal and selfless service in the Soviet Armed Forces. Allow me to wish them, with all my heart, the best of success in their new fields of activity. May they serve



there, just as loyally and selflessly, the interests of the working class and of all the working people of the Soviet Union for the triumph of communism. (*Stormy applause.*)

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE IS MADE IMPERATIVE  
BY REALITY ITSELF

Comrade Deputies, we are submitting the proposal for a further reduction of our armed forces on the eve of momentous international negotiations at which the Soviet Union's programme calling for general and complete disarmament in four years will be considered. Everyone can now see that we are not only putting forward a programme for general and complete disarmament, but are also unilaterally beginning to carry out the important measures this programme calls for, that is, taking far-reaching steps that will make it easier to reach agreement on disarmament problems. We don't use words lightly, and back our proposals with practical steps.

In international affairs, there have been instances of a proposal being made in the hope that it will under all circumstances be turned down by the other side. Such unfair practices are alien to the Soviet Union and the other socialist states. We are prepared to carry into effect what is set down in our programme for general and complete disarmament fully and consistently from the day an appropriate agreement has been reached. What is more, we are in advance creating conditions that will greatly facilitate such an agreement and will, as it were, anticipate its implementation. Can the governments of the NATO countries claim credit for any action like that? Unfortunately, there are as yet no grounds at all for saying they can.

We are undertaking a further reduction of our armed forces and we earnestly hope that other countries will do likewise.

The question may be asked why we are now undertaking a unilateral reduction of our armed forces of our own free will while in the past we broke many a lance in striving for a solution, in agreement with the Western Powers, to the problem of reducing the strength of the armed forces, that is, a solution on the basis of reciprocity. Are

not we making a concession? Will this move of ours not be interpreted as a departure from our own earlier demands?

I must tell you, Comrade Deputies, that we have taken account of the possibility of our decision being so interpreted. Nevertheless, the Government has found a unilateral reduction of our armed forces to be a timely measure—for the following reason.

The Soviet programme for general and complete disarmament was, as I have mentioned, submitted to the United Nations last September. The U.N. General Assembly resolved to refer our proposal and the disarmament proposals of other countries to the Ten Nation Committee for consideration. It is now four months since the Soviet proposals were submitted, but the Ten Nation Committee has not got down to business as yet, although five of its members—the Soviet Union, the Polish People's Republic, the Czechoslovak Republic, the Rumanian People's Republic and the People's Republic of Bulgaria—have on numerous occasions signified their readiness to carry out this decision of the Fourteenth Session of the U.N. General Assembly without delay. It had been agreed with the Western Powers that the Ten Nation Committee would meet early this year. Then the date was shifted to February—certainly not on our initiative—and now our partners have suggested postponing the meeting to March 15, which we have had to accept.

Let there be no mistake. I do not want to say anything bad either about the Ten Nation Committee itself or about the important job it is about to undertake. The Soviet Government is greatly interested in the Committee working as fruitfully as possible and accomplishing the big tasks facing it. But a good deal of experience has been gained in the course of post-war disarmament talks and we should be less than frank if we omitted mention of our apprehensions at this stage. If that regrettable experience recurs in the Ten Nation Committee, the newly-established body which is to consider disarmament issues, the progress of negotiations will be very, very slow and, probably, much water will have been drunk at the meetings of the Committee before it makes headway towards a disarmament agreement. If the matter of, say, burying a dead man were to take as much time as the discussion on the termination of the arms race has taken so

far, then the corpse would have decayed long ago and there would be nothing left to bury.

The Soviet disarmament proposals will hardly be turned down outright, for the state of affairs in the world today does not permit of such a thing. But, as we know, the equipment of Western diplomacy includes such methods as the setting up of all sorts of committees and subcommittees, the submission of reports and surveys, interminable polemics and debates on wordings. We must not rule out the possibility of all these things being brought into play by the opponents of disarmament to block constructive decisions. But we should not like anything of the sort to happen, and should like the talks to be fair and fruitful.

Suppose, however, the negotiations do take such an undesirable turn. In that case, while engaged in the negotiations, we should, contrary to our desire, be compelled to maintain our armed forces at a strength not called for, strictly speaking, by the interests of our country's defence. For it goes without saying that we would insist at the negotiations on reciprocity as a necessary condition for reducing armed forces and armaments. But our partners, by delaying agreement, would prevent us from settling the matter on the basis of reciprocity. Therefore, to maintain our country's prestige, we should have to keep our armed forces at their present strength and refrain from a unilateral reduction of them until we succeeded in persuading our partners to agree to a reciprocal reduction.

Who would be the loser? It would be our Soviet state, our people, because we should have to go on spending national funds absolutely unproductively. We should have to continue maintaining an army of the same size as today. By carrying out a unilateral reduction of the Soviet Armed Forces, we are demonstrating to the whole world, and by concrete deeds, too, our good faith, our desire to live in peace and friendship with all nations. (*Applause.*)

It goes without saying that even after reducing the strength of the Soviet Armed Forces we shall not slacken our effort to reach agreement with the West on general and complete disarmament. We want to free ourselves and others from the war menace and to reduce to naught the probability of accidents that could involve mankind in war, a war which

in present-day conditions would inevitably become a world war.

We have every reason to say that the steps which the Soviet Union takes unilaterally to ease international tension have, and will continue to have, a tremendous effect on the international situation.

Presumably, the peoples and public opinion in the West will bring greater pressure to bear on those NATO circles that would like to continue building up armed forces and armaments. Every time the question of increasing military appropriations comes up in the parliaments of capitalist countries, those of their members who are closer to the people will have good reason to point to the example set by the Soviet Union, which reduces its armed forces. Any sober-minded person in the West to whom aggressive schemes are alien will reason more or less as follows: Why should we increase our armed forces while the Soviet Union is drastically reducing its own? Of course, we can hardly expect that the rhetoric of those who keep talking year in year out about the "Soviet military threat" will run dry. But it is quite safe to say that the number of people who listen to the "cold warriors" will shrink very considerably. (*Applause.*)

Taking steps to reduce our armed forces, we say to the West: Let us seek agreement on disarmament, let us do everything to prevent war, let us compete not in building up armed forces and armaments but in reducing them, in destroying means of warfare.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are helping each other so that the economy of all the countries will reach the level of the more developed ones. Furthermore, the socialist countries consistently implement the principle of rendering assistance to economically underdeveloped countries. The working people of the socialist countries sincerely want the peoples fighting for their freedom and independence to establish an economy of their own and to stand firmly on their own feet, so that they will not depend for economic progress and a higher standard of living on hand-outs from rich capitalist powers.

The Soviet Union has been helping other countries as much as it can. I believe there is no need to list the countries receiving aid from us or to name the projects being

carried out there with our assistance, since it would be a very long list.

The reduction of our armed forces, that is, the reduction of expenditure on armaments, will provide even better opportunities for promoting our economy and, consequently, increasing assistance to the so-called underdeveloped countries.

Now as before, we declare that if agreement is reached on general and complete disarmament, which will release enormous means, it will be possible as a result to render greater assistance to all economically underdeveloped countries.

Peaceful coexistence of all countries irrespective of their internal order, of their social systems, is the fundamental question today, the question of questions in international relations. It is only through peaceful coexistence made secure by disarmament that the high road to a durable peace lies, the road to mankind's deliverance from the nightmare of devastating world wars. Not only the broad masses of the people, but also many statesmen and political leaders of the capitalist countries are realising more and more the necessity of peaceful coexistence.

But there are also those who deliberately distort the idea of peaceful coexistence. Some of the more stubborn adherents of the "cold war" are even trying to frighten the peoples away from peaceful coexistence by representing it as a kind of diabolical invention of the Communists.

We have repeatedly emphasised that peaceful coexistence is not someone's invention but an indisputable fact indicating the existence of two social systems—socialism and capitalism—in the world today. These two social systems are competing in the economic field and are engaged in an ideological struggle. This is only natural, it is a necessary stage in the development of society. The point at issue is how the question of superiority of one or the other system shall be settled, whether through peaceful competition or through military conflicts.

The dispute between the two systems can and must be settled by peaceful means; it is impermissible to settle controversies between states by force of arms. The struggle of world outlooks, the struggle for the minds and hearts of men, will continue even in conditions of the peaceful

coexistence of states with different social systems. But we propose settling ideological disputes between states not by armed force, but by the power of conviction, by good example. By taking a decision on a further reduction of our armed forces, we are setting a good example that is in line with the best ideals of mankind. What we stand for is that each system should demonstrate its advantages in the course of peaceful development and that in every country the people themselves should choose the social system they wish to maintain.

Peaceful coexistence implies that countries with opposed ideologies must, nonetheless, live in peace with each other, live side by side, coexist. Hence the term "coexistence". If there were but one ideology in the world and the same social system prevailed in all countries, there would be no antagonistic systems and the problem of coexistence as we understand it today would not arise at all. In that case, it would be simply existence and not coexistence.

As it is, however, there exist two camps in the world today, each with a different social system. The countries in these camps shape their policies along entirely different lines. In these circumstances, the problem of peaceful coexistence, that is, of safeguarding the world against the disaster of a military conflict between these two essentially antagonistic systems, between the groups of countries in which the two systems reign supreme, is of paramount importance. It is necessary to see to it that the inevitable struggle between them resolves solely into a struggle between ideologies and into peaceful emulation, or competition, to use a term that the capitalists find easier to understand. Each side will demonstrate its advantages to the best of its ability, but war as a means of settling this dispute must be ruled out. This, then, is coexistence as we Communists see it. We are upholding such coexistence with might and main, and will continue to do so. We consider that it is indispensable and inevitable in the present conditions, unless, of course, one steers deliberately for the lunacy of nuclear-rocket war.

Some Western politicians are now trying to mislead and intimidate unenlightened people who as yet know little about communist theory and to whom our communist philosophy is not clear. They seek to talk them into believing

that since the Communists proclaim their faith in the victory of communist ideology and the ultimate triumph of socialism and communism throughout the world, it follows that the Communists harbour aggressive designs, that they want to conquer the world, to rule all peoples, and so on. Need we prove that these allegations are nothing but brazen lies and slander?

The enemies of communism misrepresent our aims because they are afraid of the influence which the peace policy of the socialist countries exerts on the peoples. We have never said, of course, that our aim is to conquer the world or a part of it. What does "conquer" mean? It means forcibly to impose one's terms, one's political system, one's ideology, on the other side. But then that is not coexistence, it is interference in the internal affairs of other countries, it is war. It is something we are most emphatically opposed to.

We consider that it is impossible forcibly to impose on other peoples something they object to, something they do not want. The Communists are firmly convinced that no ideology, including communist ideology, can be implanted forcibly, by war, by bayonets.

But there is yet another side to the matter, which the ideologists of imperialism are also trying hard to conceal. No state frontiers can stop the spread of communist ideology, of Marxism-Leninism. No armies can check the progress of human thought, and even those who are expected to guard the peoples, with arms, against communist ideas often adopt these progressive ideas themselves and, instead of standing guard against communism, become carriers of the communist "bacillus", as the capitalists call it.

No bayonets, no prisons or force, can stem the ideas of communism, for the simple reason that Marxism-Leninism is an expression of the vital interests of the working people, that it is the truth. Communist society is a society based on complete justice, freedom, equality, and genuine respect for man. Whatever guards one may post, however much one may try to fool people, they will in the end see and understand what is true and what isn't, what is good and what is bad. That is why we are confident that the cause of communism will triumph in the end. Communism will win, but not in the sense that the socialist countries will conquer the other countries. No, the people of each country

will themselves weigh all the facts and when they have appreciated the essence of Marxism-Leninism, they will of their own free will choose the more progressive social system.

As for seeing which system is more progressive and just, that is going to be easier from day to day. Millions of people see the evils of capitalism and feel the heavy burden and utter iniquity of that system of oppression, and as time goes on they will see them better and feel them more. The peoples of the capitalist countries see that capitalism means glaring contrasts between the opulence of the few and the hard life and semi-starvation of the working man, that it means millions thrown on the streets as unemployed, and constant uncertainty as to the future on the part of those who still have work. The working people of the capitalist countries know well what it is to fall ill and have no money for treatment, no money to call a doctor and pay for medicines sold at outrageous prices, what it is to be unable to send their children to school.

And when people in the capitalist countries compare their living conditions with those in the socialist countries, where the people have long forgotten all these troubles, the conclusions that occur to them are not hard to guess. When they compare the low rate of economic development in the capitalist countries with the rapid progress of the national economy of the socialist countries, the imperialist policy of "cold war" and arms race with the peaceful foreign policy of the socialist countries and their struggle for disarmament, they realise which social system is more just and progressive.

While today capitalist propaganda still succeeds in scaring some little-informed people with communism, we can say with confidence that it is a strictly temporary phenomenon. When these people have seen what is what, they will be ashamed of their present error, and not every grandfather will make bold to confess to his grandchildren that there was a time when he was against communism.

Some of the more far-sighted ideologists and policy-makers of capitalism are already coming to realise that the social system under which they live and which they defend is historically doomed. They are afraid of it, and try to stave off the inevitable. They do their utmost to gloss over

the facts, and avoid calling a spade a spade in the hope of befogging the minds of the masses.

Take the calls for extending "aid" to the economically backward countries that are coming more and more frequently from Western statesmen and politicians. It is necessary to feed the starving in those countries, they say, or they will claim their rights. To be sure, these calls are accompanied by a variety of fine words about generosity, humanity and so on. But what do they actually indicate? Certainly not Christian love of neighbour, but a most ordinary and selfish fear on the part of the monopolists.

For decades and even centuries, the imperialists and colonialists plundered the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America which they now have so "generous" an intention of helping. They extracted untold wealth from the bowels of those countries but deliberately kept those who extracted it for them in poverty and ignorance, and exploited them mercilessly. That is why dozens of countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America are poor today and rank as economically underdeveloped. It is not at all because the soil in those countries is poorer than elsewhere or the populations less capable and industrious, but because foreign exploiters profited by their labour and resources, and waxed rich at their expense. The result is a situation where the annual per capita national income in the colonial powers ranges between approximately \$1,000 and \$2,000, while in the backward countries it is a mere \$100 or even less.

The time has come when the robbed are beginning to realise who robbed them and who is to blame for their plight. And they are already raising their voice in reminder. That is why the colonialists are beginning to sense that the hour of reckoning will come soon, and are trying to extricate themselves somehow from this situation.

The existence and progress of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are no doubt playing a tremendous part in the growth of the self-consciousness of the colonial or former colonial and semi-colonial countries. Their progress is there for all to see. Once these countries—China and some others, for instance—were themselves exploited and economically backward. But today they have changed beyond recognition. They have made immense progress in economy and culture, and in the building of a

new society. The socialist states thereby graphically demonstrate the advantages of socialism as a more just and progressive social system. And there is no escaping these facts for the capitalist gentlemen. No matter how much they distort our Marxist-Leninist theory, no matter how much they revile us, the peoples are becoming more and more clear-sighted. They see, and become increasingly convinced, that only by throwing off the tyranny of the exploiters can they win genuine freedom, peace and happiness. (*Prolonged applause.*)

The moribund capitalist society is being succeeded by a new, just society which provides equal conditions for all and offers all benefits to every working man. The road of this new society is strewn with the magnificent flowers of freedom, equality, abundance and peace, and its victorious advance is irresistible. Such is the law of historical progress. (*Stormy applause.*)

\* \* \*

Comrade Deputies, I have submitted to you, on instructions from the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government, new proposals for the reduction of our armed forces. By putting these proposals into practice, our country will make an important contribution to a durable world peace.

The Soviet people are confident of their strength and their splendid communist future. That is why we will continue to press boldly, firmly and vigorously for disarmament and for providing conditions for peaceful coexistence. The Soviet people will do everything for other countries, big and small, also to take this road.

Following unswervingly the road of building a communist society, the Soviet Union will continue firmly to uphold the great cause of peace among the nations. (*Stormy applause.*)

Long live peace throughout the world! (*Stormy, prolonged applause. All rise.*)

**LAW**  
**ON A FURTHER CONSIDERABLE REDUCTION**  
**OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE U.S.S.R.**

Passed on January 15, 1960

(*Gazette of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.*,  
No. 3, 1960)

Having carefully studied the present international situation and thoroughly weighed all circumstances, the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers it possible and advisable to undertake a further considerable reduction of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R.

In adopting this decision the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. proceeds from the fact that the great triumphs scored by the Soviet people in building communism have ensured an unprecedented growth of our country's might and have given rise to basic changes in the international situation. The might of the socialist camp as a whole is likewise influencing this situation on a steadily growing scale.

In these conditions, with the understanding and support of all peace-loving forces in the world, the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the camp of socialism has secured a certain improvement in the international situation. For the first time in many years, tension in the relations between states belonging to different social systems has begun to relax. An extremely important contribution towards the relaxation of this tension was made by the historic visit to the United States of America by N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., and his talks with President Eisenhower of the U.S.A.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union is based on the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. Guided by this principle, the Soviet State has, from the very first days of its existence, consistently and perseveringly worked to preserve and con-

solidate peace on earth. General and complete disarmament is the most reliable and dependable means of securing lasting peace and friendship among nations and for ever delivering mankind from the calamities of bloody wars.

In pursuance of this lofty purpose, the Soviet Government has submitted a programme of general and complete disarmament for consideration to the United Nations. This proposal of the Soviet Government has received wide support among all the peoples of the world. The idea of general and complete disarmament has won the unanimous approval of all the member states of the United Nations.

In its tireless efforts to secure a relaxation of international tension, the Soviet Union has frequently initiated steps aimed at putting an end to the arms race and beginning disarmament as soon as possible. More than that, the Soviet Union has backed this initiative with practical measures and carried these measures out unilaterally. The Soviet Union has abolished its military bases in the territory of other countries, substantially reduced the strength of its armed forces and its military expenditures, again stopped testing atomic and hydrogen weapons and decided not to resume these tests providing the Western Powers do not renew their tests.

Wishing to make a further contribution towards ensuring peace and creating the most favourable conditions for reaching agreement on general and complete disarmament, the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics *decrees*:

Article 1. To carry out a further considerable reduction of the Armed Forces, namely, by 1,200,000 men.

Article 2. In this connection to disband the corresponding number of units, formations and military schools of the Soviet Army and Navy, and correspondingly reduce armaments and also the military expenditures of the Soviet Union from the State Budget of the U.S.S.R.

Article 3. To instruct the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.:

a) to take the necessary steps to carry out Articles 1 and 2 of this Law, draw up a concrete time-table for the reduction of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. and ensure the men released from the Armed Forces with employment in the national economy;

b) to maintain the country's defensive capacity on the required level and preserve the necessary Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. and armaments until international agreement is reached on general and complete disarmament.

\* \* \*

In passing this Law, the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics expresses the hope that the new reduction of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. will be a stimulating example for other countries, particularly those with the greatest military might. This would thereby facilitate agreement on general and complete disarmament.

MESSAGE  
OF THE SUPREME SOVIET  
OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS  
TO THE PARLIAMENTS AND GOVERNMENTS  
OF ALL THE STATES IN THE WORLD

Adopted on January 15, 1960

*(Gazette of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.,  
No. 3, 1960)*

The Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has decided to address a message to the parliaments and governments of all the states in the world on a question of vital importance that concerns the interests of the whole of mankind.

Without waiting for the question of disarmament to be agreed upon on an international level, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. has decreed a further large reduction of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. We have passed a Law on reducing them by another third, namely, by one million two hundred thousand men. The armaments of the army and navy and also military expenditures will be reduced.

When the Law we have adopted today will have been put into effect, two million four hundred and twenty-three thousand men will remain in our army and navy.

It will be recalled that during the discussion of the disarmament problem in 1956, the U.S.A., Britain and France proposed that the Soviet Union and the United States of America should each have two and a half million men in their armed forces. The Soviet Government, it goes without saying, accepted their proposal on the assumption that it will only be the first step in disarmament. But as soon as the Soviet Union accepted the proposed figure, those who proposed it turned it down themselves.

Three years have passed since then. Efforts to reach agreement with the Western Powers proved unsuccessful. The question arises: What next? Our Government, which

has, prior to this, already reduced our armed forces and military budget several times unilaterally, has decided to take a new courageous and noble step, that of again considerably reducing our armed forces without further delay.

In passing the Law on a Further Considerable Reduction of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R., the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. proceeded from a realistic evaluation of the international situation now taking shape. Indeed, there has been a marked relaxation in tension in the relations between states. The prospects for strengthening peace are now much greater. The indisputable truth that peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems is a historical fact and a vital necessity in the modern stage of human development is being increasingly appreciated by the peoples and by political leaders and statesmen.

Meetings and contacts between leading statesmen are becoming an effective method of decreasing tension and settling the most complicated international issues. The visit paid to the U.S.A. by N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., and his talks with President Dwight D. Eisenhower started a new page in international relations—peaceful talks aimed at settling outstanding international problems left over from the Second World War or engendered in the years of the arms race and the “cold war”. The only possible way of settling outstanding issues is through negotiation. This is one of the principal conclusions that was recognised and recorded in the Joint Soviet-American Communiqué of September 27, 1959. An atmosphere of frankness, a direct and open statement of one's positions and a constructive approach with regard to mutual interests, which marked the talks between the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. and the President of the U.S.A., are an example which has to be followed if there is a genuine desire to achieve a sweeping improvement of the international situation.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. expresses the hope that a similar constructive approach will be displayed at the coming conference of heads of state, on the convocation of which agreement has now at last been reached. The peoples expect that this Summit meeting will lead to new positive improvements in international relations and will help to solve the problem of disarmament.

In its Message of October 31, 1959, to the Parliaments of All Countries of the World, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. called upon the parliaments and parliamentarians of all countries to utilise the present favourable international situation and do their utmost to deliver the peoples from that terrible scourge—the arms race, and open the road to lasting peace for the whole of mankind.

In passing the Law on a Further Considerable Reduction of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R., we express the hope that for their part the parliaments and parliamentarians of other countries will take the same road. It is time to pass from talk about disarmament to practical measures. Only if that is done will it be possible to carry out the great task which was unanimously approved by the representatives of all states at the recent General Assembly of the United Nations, where, on behalf of the Soviet Government, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. set forth a plan of general and complete disarmament.

Never in the history of man has an arms race and war psychosis been so dangerous as in our day. Armies equipped with the most terrible means of annihilation are facing each other. In such conditions any misguided action or malicious intent by individual statesmen may plunge the world into the abyss of a military catastrophe.

Modern weapons are infinite in their destructive power and range. A single hydrogen bomb can wipe major centres of world civilisation off the face of the earth. A few hydrogen bombs are enough to destroy entire countries. And yet the stockpiles of atomic and hydrogen bombs are growing steadily.

As a result of the continued arms race masses of people have been torn away from peaceful endeavour and are either serving in the armed forces or engaged in producing means of destruction. The flower of human society—millions of workers, engineers, scientists, talented and industrious people, whose brains and energies could have done so much for the welfare of the nations, are at present spending their strength in order to create ever more terrible lethal weapons. And the more money is spent on the arms race, the more guns, tanks, rockets and other weapons are produced, the heavier will be the burden of taxes shouldered by the peoples. Cessation of the arms race would make it possible



to direct large additional resources into housing construction, public health and education, increasing the incomes of the working people and aid to the economically underdeveloped countries.

Implementation of the great programme of general and complete disarmament, put forward by the Soviet Union, would allow turning immense material and spiritual forces towards the creation of a life worthy of man.

In the past four years alone the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. have been unilaterally reduced by a total of 2,140,000 men, and now we are again reducing them by a further 1,200,000 men. In the course of these years the Soviet Union has completely withdrawn its troops from the Rumanian People's Republic, substantially reduced its armed forces stationed in the German Democratic Republic and the Hungarian People's Republic, and dismantled its military bases in the territory of other states.

The Soviet Union is systematically, from year to year, reducing the allocations on military requirements from the State Budget of the U.S.S.R. In 1960 the share of these allocations only added up to 12.9 per cent of the total expenditures of the State Budget of the U.S.S.R. as against 19.9 per cent in 1955.

We sincerely believe that the adoption of the Law on a Further Considerable Reduction of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R. by the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. will be a major contribution towards further improving the international situation.

Today, when talks between states on the question of general and complete disarmament are at hand, particularly great importance attaches to practical unilateral steps to reduce armaments. Such measures by states would help to create an atmosphere of trust and would contribute to the success of the forthcoming talks. They are all the more necessary because in spite of the relaxation of international tension that has been achieved there still are forces in the world that are trying to hinder the discontinuance of the universally hated "cold war" and arms race. West Germany is being rearmed and the supply of atomic and rocket weapons to her is fraught with grave consequences to the cause of peace in Europe and in the world as a whole. In some countries demands that the long-bankrupt "from posi-

tions of strength" policy be continued are still being made openly.

All this requires that those who sincerely desire to deliver the peoples from the horrors of another war should not relax their efforts directed towards the achievement of an agreement on disarmament. In this respect much can be done by parliaments and parliamentarians. It is their duty and responsibility to their peoples to use every opportunity to help stop the arms race and settle the problem of disarmament.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. expresses the hope that the new unilateral step taken by the Soviet Union to reduce its armed forces will serve as an example to other countries, particularly to countries with the greatest military power.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. calls upon the parliaments and governments of all countries of the world to respond to the new initiative of the Soviet Union and, for their part, to take practical steps to reduce the existing armed forces, deliver the peoples of their countries from the burden of armaments, free mankind from the threat of war and ensure peace the world over.

## REPORT

by Deputy A. A. Gromyko,

Minister for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R.,

"On the Geneva Negotiations" Delivered at the First Session  
of the Sixth Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.

April 24, 1962

*(Sittings of the First Session of the Sixth Supreme Soviet  
of the U.S.S.R. Verbatim Record)*

Comrade Deputies, in the days when the Soviet people were preparing with remarkable unanimity and patriotic enthusiasm for the election to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament began its work in Geneva. The fact that today the First Session of the new Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. is also hearing a Soviet Government report on the Geneva negotiations is further evidence of the tremendous attention our country devotes to the solution of the problems that have come to the fore on the world scene.

The chief task of Soviet foreign policy as formulated in the Party Programme adopted by the historic Twenty Second Congress of the C.P.S.U. is to provide peaceful conditions for building communist society in the Soviet Union and developing the world socialist system, and together with all peace-loving peoples to deliver mankind from a world war of extermination. The effort to fulfil this great task is being pressed forward on all diplomatic fronts under the direct everyday leadership of the Leninist Central Committee of our Party.

To use a figure of speech, two policies clashed in Geneva.

Spokesmen of one policy—the delegations of the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Bulgaria—brought proposals of their governments clearing the way for a radical solution of the disarmament problem and for the immediate conclusion of an agreement to end all nuclear weapons tests for all time. The delegations of the neutralist countries, too, arrived in Geneva—we may now say this

plainly—with the intention of contributing to the solution of the disarmament problem and to the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests.

Spokesmen of the other policy—the delegations of the Western Powers—brought to Geneva an entirely different kind of goods. The policy of those powers is aimed at ensuring that the Committee encounters further obstacles in its effort to reach agreement on disarmament and that, moreover, its meetings are accompanied by the thunder of nuclear explosions.

True, before the Committee began its work the heads of the U.S. and British delegations held in the lobby heated discussions about disarmament. From what they said one might have imagined that they had all but brought with them a draft agreement on general and complete disarmament ready for signing and were going to hand it to us right in the corridor of the Palais des Nations, even before the Ministers took their places at the conference table, as if to say: "Here's the text, let us sign it and put an end to it." But, of course, nothing of the kind happened.

As regards France, whose government declared, before the Committee began its work, that it was interested in solving the disarmament problem, she has simply left her seat at the conference vacant. This is said to have a deep meaning. If so, it must be so deep that common sense cannot fathom it.

What did the Committee begin with? On the instructions of the Soviet Government our delegation submitted, at the very first meeting, a concrete draft Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament Under Strict International Control. The draft is based on the memorable programme which N. S. Khrushchov, head of the Soviet Government, proclaimed from the rostrum of the U.N. General Assembly two and a half years ago. Mankind will always be grateful to the Soviet Government for putting forward that historic programme inspired by humanism and by the desire to deliver the peoples for ever from the calamities of war.

It would be no exaggeration to say that the submission of our draft Treaty was the outstanding event in the work of the Eighteen Nation Committee.

Some people on the Committee told us frankly that while they had looked forward to new major proposals on

the part of the Soviet Government, they had had no idea that it would come forward with a document specifying the whole process of disarmament, from beginning to end, in such clear and precise terms, in almost mathematical language. The interest aroused by our proposals throughout the world was so great that the spokesmen of the Western Powers did not this time venture to affect indifference. Indeed, they would hardly have succeeded under the circumstances.

When the Eighteen Nation Committee had just begun its work a U.N. report was published in Geneva pointing out that the world's military spending is about \$120,000 million a year. This amount nearly equals half the sum spent annually by way of capital investment throughout the world. You may recall that the armed forces of the countries of the world, the war industry and the industries catering for it employ approximately 100 million people. The Soviet Government solemnly proposes ending this folly.

You are familiar with the draft Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament, Comrade Deputies. I will therefore say only a few words about it. It is a Treaty whose every section and every paragraph is replete with specific commitments on the part of states with regard to disarmament measures and to corresponding measures of control.

As soon as the Treaty became operative, the arms race, which today involves dozens of countries, would begin to decline—armaments would start to flow continuously from the arsenals and stores to be destroyed under international control, until the armouries and dumps were completely emptied. In a mere four years no more nuclear bombs, no tanks and artillery, no navies and no air forces at all would be left, the armies would be completely disbanded and all military institutions—from general staffs to military commissariats—would be abolished.

It is proposed to break up and eliminate the whole war machine in three consecutive stages, within which disarmament and control measures would be so distributed as to prevent any state from gaining unilateral military advantages in the course of disarmament.

At the very first stage, that is, in less than two years, a danger would be removed which has caused concern to the peoples of all countries ever since Hiroshima—the

danger of nuclear attack. Hydrogen and atom bombs would, as it were, be tied down in their depots, where they would lie as immobilised *matériel*, since all vehicles capable of carrying those weapons to their target, that is, military rockets, pilotless aircraft, bombers, surface ships and submarines, would be destroyed. Nuclear bombs would under the circumstances be no more usable than bullets without a rifle or revolver. Military bases on foreign soil, those springboards of aggression, would be dismantled and troops would be kept where they belong in peace time, that is, only within their national boundaries. Besides, those troops would be substantially reduced in strength; specifically, the armed forces of the Soviet Union and the United States would each be no more than 1,700,000 strong.

The threat of nuclear war would be completely removed as a result of the implementation of the measures planned for the second stage, that is, by the end of the third year of disarmament. For the second stage, the Soviet draft Treaty envisages a ban on nuclear arms and other weapons of mass destruction, to be attended by the elimination of all stockpiles of such weapons and by the discontinuance of their manufacture. The further reduction of national armed forces at that stage, including the reduction of those of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. to 1,000,000 men for each power, would lessen the likelihood of any military conflicts.

War would be banished for ever from the life of society on completion of the third stage, that is, by the end of the fourth year of disarmament, during which all the other armed forces and armaments and the entire war machinery of the states would have to be abolished.

During the previous disarmament talks Western representatives asked what was to be done if, after the disarmament process had been completed, countries suddenly started to fight, using, say, hand-guns and daggers. To remove all cause for doubt, the Soviet Government has provided in its draft Treaty for the formation, within the framework of the UNO, of international armed forces to be placed under appropriate command, precluding the use of those forces for the narrow aims of particular countries.

These Soviet proposals actually formed the basis of the negotiations between states held in the Eighteen Nation Committee. It goes without saying that the question of the

obligations to be assumed by the Chinese People's Republic under a disarmament agreement can only be discussed and settled with the C.P.R. participating. We made this clear to our conference partners at the outset of the Committee's work.

Geneva, whose very paving stones could tell of the sad experience of fruitless attempts to initiate disarmament, witnessed for the first time discussions launched with a strong desire on the part of the overwhelming majority of the delegates to reach agreement on disarmament.

Our draft Treaty, which also expresses the peace policy of the other socialist countries, aroused the liveliest interest and won support for its fundamental propositions among the neutralist countries represented on the Committee.

We saw that the Indian delegation was striving to steer a course similar to ours when its head, Mr. Krishna Menon, stated at the Committee meeting on March 20: "We think that either a treaty or a draft of a treaty ... covering the whole of this picture must emerge from this Conference."

Next day Dr. Fawzi, Foreign Minister of the United Arab Republic, declared that "the draft treaty submitted by the Soviet Government 'on general and complete disarmament' seems to represent some steps in the right direction".

We were gratified to hear Mr. Wachuku, Foreign Minister of the young African state of Nigeria, say the following: "My delegation and indeed my country, Nigeria, believe passionately in peace, and will work unrelentingly toward the achievement of general and complete disarmament."

Similar considerations were clearly discernible in the statements of the representatives of almost all the neutralist countries.

What about the Western Powers? What was their stand in the Committee?

The United States and its allies submitted no draft treaty at all by the time the Committee had begun its work, nor was that an accident, of course. Apparently, they find it rather difficult to pass from general, occasionally fine-sounding phrases about the benefits of disarmament to the statement of specific undertakings that could go into the articles of a treaty on general and complete disarma-

ment. That is exactly the reason why, in discussing our draft at Committee meetings, Western representatives keep dodging the problems that have to be solved. Evidently, our draft is too hot for some people.

Over a month had passed since the Committee first met, and the Committee members had long been busy considering the Soviet draft Treaty article by article, when the Committee received a document from the U.S. Government, headed "Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty". As you see, this time, too, the U.S. Government has submitted only an outline, which, moreover, is not an outline of the treaty itself, but of what is called "basic provisions", although the question of basic provisions has been under discussion for fifteen years.

What is the content of the proposals laid by the U.S. Government on the conference table in Geneva? What did the Western delegations at Geneva carry in their brief-cases? It appears that they carried prepared declarations on control, meaning control over armament and not disarmament, as if the function of the Eighteen Nation Committee were to spur on the arms race instead of seeking agreement on disarmament.

The result is that although the delegates of the Western Powers sit beside us in the conference hall of the Palais des Nations, whose walls are painted with the horrors of war, the statements they make are virtually in favour of continuing the arms race and not in favour of destroying the weapons of war.

Western spokesmen constantly insist that before any disarmament is effected it is necessary to safeguard the security of all countries and free them from fear of attack, and that, they say, is just what control is needed for. Nations can disarm, they argue, only when they stop being afraid of each other. But then there may always be people who will say they are afraid of the Soviet Union or some other country and therefore cannot disarm. Does that mean, then, that we must bury the cause of disarmament? Besides, how are we to determine at all whether that fear is real or feigned?

In the Eighteen Nation Committee, the U.S. Government decided to make somewhat refurbished proposals for control. In what sense has it modified its stand?

As in the past, the U.S. Government advocates establishing control for the sake of control, or for the sake of reconnaissance to be exact. The only difference is that this time it says no one should worry that the control bodies would at once extend their activity to the whole territory of a country. To begin with, it says, let us divide every country into sections, or geographical zones. As soon as armed forces and armaments began to be cut—if only by 10 per cent—we would open those sections to enable the control personnel to enter any one of them at any time they wish, and to exercise their control not only over the armed forces and armaments being reduced, but also over those remaining. And it is represented as something entirely new that the control personnel would not inspect all the zones at once, as if it could make any real difference to us that that kind of control over disarmament, that is, virtually international espionage, would be effected in one zone of the Soviet Union, say, early in May and in another late in May.

But that is nothing new at all. NATO generals simply want to use those sections as a means of organising a sort of X-ray examination of the whole area of the Soviet Union. Here are some revealing illustrations.

The U.S. Assistant Secretary for Defence, Mr. Gilpatrick, made no bones about declaring, when the Eighteen Nation Committee had already begun its work, that as far as the Pentagon was concerned, the important thing was to “determine precisely” the system of targets on Soviet territory, adding that this would make it possible to prepare more devastating blows with less expenditure. And here is another utterance in favour of reconnaissance on Soviet soil: “The reconnaissance of targets is becoming the decisive factor in air warfare.” This statement is straightforward enough and as blunt as any Blimp can make it, and it comes from a man who seems to be versed in the strategic problems of NATO. He is Helmut Schmidt, a West German military expert—the blabbing kind, it is true, but an expert nevertheless.

As you see, the proposal for inspection by zones is not very original. Yet the U.S. Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, tried to make it out to be almost a concession to the Soviet demand that control measures be coupled with disarmament measures.

Much the same was proposed at Geneva by Lord Home, the British Foreign Secretary. He began by saying that he was going to contribute to bringing the positions of the Soviet Union and the United States closer together on the question of control and on all else that could serve to ease international tension. That is a good intention, of course. In fact, why should Britain not work towards that end? After all, British diplomacy has substantial experience both in bringing positions closer together and in helping to move them further apart.

However, when the British side revealed its proposals, “compromise” turned out to mean the same idea of control as is advanced by the U.S. Government, except that Britain prefers it to be done not on the territorial principle alone, but on the industrial sector principle as well. If, say, the first stage of disarmament provides for the scrapping of a certain number of rockets, control officials are to be sent at once to a corresponding number of plants manufacturing those rockets, and as for the U.S. military bases in Europe and elsewhere, they are to be left intact, whereas there are hydrogen and atom bombs at those bases.

Now what has that to do with an attempt to bring positions closer together?

Incidentally, when Secretary of State Home was in Geneva he spoke a great deal about the need to seek ways of bringing positions closer together and relaxing the tension between East and West. But he had hardly returned to London when, in a speech he made in the House of Lords the very next day, he said no more and no less than the following: “Tension may be part of our human condition. It may be a pre-condition of progress, and without tension we would stagnate.”

The question arises: which British Minister are we to believe? Is it to be the one who in Geneva advocated bringing the positions of East and West closer together and lessening tension, or the other who addressed the House of Lords?

Eighteen months ago Comrade Khrushchov said at the 15th Session of the U.N. General Assembly that the Soviet Government was willing to accept any Western proposals for control over disarmament provided the Western Powers accepted our proposals for general and complete disarmament.

Where is the reply of the Western Powers to that statement of the head of the Soviet Government? There is no reply.

During the Geneva discussions our conference partners from the West also made direct attempts to secure for themselves unilateral advantages in disarmament to the detriment of the security of the Soviet Union. The United States, for example, proposes reducing nuclear weapon delivery vehicles, and basic conventional weapons, by 30 per cent in three years. For one fleeting moment this may seem to be a disarmament measure, after all. But the question asks itself at once: what are the types of armament by means of which the U.S. Government expects to scrape together the 30 per cent cut?

The idea was already clear when the U.S. Secretary of State declared in the Eighteen Nation Committee: "We propose that strategic delivery vehicles be reduced not only in numbers but also in destructive capability." The aims of the U.S. Government became clearer still after it had submitted to the Committee the outline I have mentioned. First and foremost it is interested in missiles having a range of 5,000 kilometres or more, that is, intercontinental and global missiles.

As for things like U.S. military bases and troops on foreign soil, including those not far from the frontiers of socialist countries—bases and troops having bomber aircraft and rocket installations—the U.S. Government again lost sight of them as of something of a trifle. The U.S. proposals put off their abolition to the last stage, the third, and what is more, they give no indication at all of the length of that stage, which may be taken to last ten, twenty or fifty years. In other words, no time limits are set for the dismantling of foreign military bases and for the withdrawal of troops from foreign soil. One wonders what becomes of American efficiency and punctuality when it is a question of fixing the time limits for the abolition of foreign military bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops.

Plainly, this proposal, which is aimed at undermining the defence might of the Soviet Union while leaving the military fist of NATO clenched, envisages anything but agreement.

Surely that is not fair partnership in disarmament talks. For we are told, in effect, that the rockets at U.S. mili-

tary bases will be trained on us as in the past, and bombers will stand by there with their motors running and with loads of nuclear bombs on board, and as for us, the Soviet Union, we are expected to rely on the peaceful intentions of NATO and scrap our intercontinental and global missiles. How can this stand of the Western Powers make for confidence, and can we consider that they are taking a serious approach to disarmament problems? We certainly have no grounds for such an opinion.

One cannot help recalling at this point the stand of the main participants in the disarmament talks, in the League of Nations. At that time the Western Powers admitted of disarmament, if at all, only at the expense of the Soviet Union. Indeed, they would have had nothing at all against the Soviet Union disarming. But whenever it was a question of reducing air forces, navies and other armaments, they could not come to terms even among themselves. Britain, France, Germany and Italy made of the negotiations a sort of game in which everyone was trying to fool everyone else. The British, as we know, have never really liked submarines. That is why they sought to bring about the scrapping of submarines, which France showed off. The French, on the other hand, urged the scrapping of battleships, the pride of the British Admiralty. Either side tried on various pretexts to keep intact the armaments in which it was strong.

M. Briand, then Foreign Minister of France, who saw perfectly through the stratagems used by the two parties, once said sarcastically: "The British Admiralty builds battleships to fish herring in the Channel, and we build our submarines to explore the floor of that strait."

The U.S. representatives who have put forward their proposal concerning missiles are evidently not in a joking mood, but their stand is not far removed from what M. Briand ridiculed so wittily. They seem to say: "We don't like Soviet missiles—they fly too far and hit their targets too well. They should be destroyed. As regards our atomic bomber bases scattered all over the world, they should be retained." But what for? Surely not for weather observation?

To that we could say, if we followed M. Briand's example: "Remove your bases, destroy your aircraft—they smoke too hard in the sky. As regards our missiles, we will

keep them because we need them to measure the temperature above the clouds."

The U.S. Government is becoming more and more insistent in stressing in the Committee the necessity of banning the use of outer space for military purposes. We have noticed that it has been particularly insistent in proposing that since Comrade Khrushchov's statement about the making of a global missile in the Soviet Union. Of course, a ban on the military use of outer space would be a good idea, and the Soviet Government has also made proposals on this score. Our draft Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament contains a special provision to the effect that the launching of rockets and space devices should be carried out exclusively for peaceful purposes. But this cannot be decided in isolation from other disarmament measures.

How does the U.S. Government visualise the decision of this question? To judge by the utterances of the U.S. representatives on the Committee, this question, too, is being raised by the United States with an eye to getting at intercontinental and global missiles and depriving the Soviet Union of its more powerful means of defence and of retaliation against an aggressor.

Can we consider such a proposal to be aimed at a disarmament agreement? No, we cannot, in this case either.

The Eighteen Nation Committee has yet another U.S. proposal, which calls for discontinuing at the first stage the production of fissionable materials for military purposes and for each party turning, say, 50 tons of such materials to peaceful uses. Credulous people may at first imagine that this proposal either leads straight to disarmament or, at any rate, circles somewhere about it. In reality it has nothing in common with disarmament.

For it is well known that the countries concerned have already accumulated such quantities of fissionable materials that even if their stocks are somewhat reduced, a great many nuclear bombs and charges can still be made from these materials. Needless to say that the atom and hydrogen bombs already manufactured will not at all be affected by the measure which the United States proposes, and they will continue to be fully ready for use against peoples.

Note that in this case, too, the United States is to keep its ramified network of military bases on foreign soil, including areas adjoining the Soviet Union.

This is, in substance, all that the Western Powers are proposing to us at Geneva. You will see, Comrade Deputies, that the U.S. proposals in the Eighteen Nation Committee, which are backed by America's NATO allies, imply anything but general and complete disarmament. It would be more proper to say that they have no bearing at all on disarmament.

Now for the main objections which the U.S. and British Governments are raising against our draft Treaty in addition to the issue of control, which I have already dealt with. Most of their polemical shafts are aimed at the fact that one of the steps envisaged for the first stage of disarmament is the withdrawal of troops from foreign soil—naturally, with the simultaneous dismantling of foreign military bases. Implementation of the Soviet proposals, the spokesmen of the two powers contend, would lead to something terrible: the U.S. troops would pull out of Europe across the ocean, while the Soviet troops would still be in Europe, although they, too, would have gone home from Poland, the German Democratic Republic and Hungary.

We may well ask: where should Soviet troops be on coming back home but in the Soviet Union?

The opponents of the Soviet proposals resort to yet another argument. There is little point, they say, in reaching agreement on a treaty on general and complete disarmament, because the legislative bodies of some Western Powers will not ratify the treaty anyway. They may agree to the adoption of certain measures, but we had better not introduce at all the whole set of disarmament measures, which are expected to be carried out over a number of years.

It is known, for example, that the U.S. Congress is now considering a programme in which the growth of U.S. armaments in the next five years is meticulously scheduled stage by stage. It follows that the U.S. Congress can adopt a five-year armament programme but does not see its way to adopt a four-year programme for general and complete disarmament.

But such a state of affairs is hardly acceptable in international relations.

From the very first days the participants in the Geneva discussions were faced with the problem of organising their work in such a way as to make it fruitful. Since the Soviet Union was the only one to have submitted a draft Treaty covering the entire process of disarmament from beginning to end, most of the members of the Eighteen Nation Committee inclined, naturally, to the opinion that the order of discussion in the Committee should follow that document, article by article.

The delegations which do not like our draft took this fact into account, even though reluctantly. But the Committee had scarcely got down to discussing our draft when the Western delegations began to urge us to let various groups of technical experts to work on the Treaty, to let them study and discuss it. But anyone who is more or less familiar with what the work of experts means when they are assigned disarmament questions knows well that it is the surest way to ruin the enterprise. It is not for nothing that the technical experts who in the past were drawn into disarmament negotiations have become the butt of jokes. They are said—also by themselves—to be people who every year are learning more and more about less and less. If the Committee were to take that road, none of the Ministers attending at the initial stage of the Committee's work would probably live to see the end of the experts' discussions. Besides, it would take more than one generation of experts to handle the job.

What has occurred in the Eighteen Nation Committee since it began its work is added evidence that contrary to the will of the peoples, certain circles in the West are trying to set up more and more and ever higher barriers to disarmament. It is known that behind the policy of blocking disarmament are small but influential monopoly groups.

Those groups fear disarmament only because they fear that they may be deprived of the fabulous profits they are making from the manufacture of destructive weapons. For them arms production is a gold conveyor belt which may be said to deliver simultaneously nuclear bombs, rockets and bombers as well as dollars, pounds sterling and francs,

which accumulate in the bank accounts of arms manufacturers.

Along with drafting a treaty on general and complete disarmament, the Eighteen Nation Committee is discussing a Soviet proposal which calls for effecting even now, without waiting till the negotiations on general and complete disarmament are finished, a series of steps to ease world tension, promote international confidence and create a more favourable atmosphere for disarmament. What are these steps? They are the prohibition of war propaganda, the establishment of denuclearised zones in various parts of the globe, the prevention of the further spread of nuclear arms, renunciation of their use, and so on. These proposals brought a favourable response from most of the participants in the negotiations.

Take the proposal for establishing denuclearised zones. The delegates of the independent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America are greatly preoccupied with the U.S. policy of stationing U.S. nuclear arms on foreign soil. Sr. Dantas, Foreign Minister of Brazil, voicing that sentiment, rightly posed the question: who is to decide on the use of those arms? And he answered his own question, saying that it would not be the countries where those arms were stationed but the countries which owned them. His speech expressed legitimate concern over the security of countries if foreign generals were to order the use of nuclear arms stationed on the territory of countries lacking such arms. That concern was shared, in particular, by the delegates of Ethiopia, Nigeria and Burma, who supported the idea of establishing atom-free zones in Africa and other areas. The Mexican Government has adopted a decision banning the import of nuclear arms into Mexico, thereby beginning on its own, so to say, to implement the idea of an atom-free zone.

The detailed proposal of the Polish People's Republic for an atom-free zone in Central Europe likewise aroused great interest among the Committee members. It was justly assessed by many delegations as a useful idea, as a wise measure for the promotion of European peace.

One of the proposals under discussion is the Soviet proposal for banning war propaganda, a proposal which the Soviet Government has been putting forward over a number



of years. It is encouraging that most of the delegations have already pronounced themselves in favour of adopting an international declaration outlawing war propaganda. But, unfortunately, the U.S. representatives are trying to raise obstacles. They have no arguments to advance against our proposal for banning war propaganda, and besides, it would be rather awkward to contend against such a proposal. Nevertheless, they do contend against it, and what is more, in recent days it has occurred to them that if appeals for war are to be banned, perhaps a ban could also be put on Marxism-Leninism. (*Laughter.*) The U.S. Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, made no such statement during his stay in Geneva. But later on his deputy in the delegation, Mr. Dean, who must be a daredevil, made up his mind to bang away, so to speak. Even Geneva old-timers can remember nothing quite like it.

That is the situation as regards the talks in the Eighteen Nation Committee.

You will see, Comrade Deputies, that there is no reason to think the Committee has come close to working out real disarmament measures.

Had our task been merely to expose certain circles of the capitalist powers and their policy on disarmament, we would not have had to stay in Geneva for so long. Three days would have been enough to reveal that those circles are as unwilling to disarm as ever. But our task is to fight for disarmament, to demonstrate the necessity of disarmament, in particular to the Western Powers, and that is what our country and our allies have been doing.

While the Committee is only past the initial stage of its work, it is obvious already that the pressure of popular demand for general and complete disarmament is bringing a fresh breeze into the negotiations. Those opposed to disarmament are clearly on the defensive. A factor for this, comrades, is the truly titanic effort made by the Central Committee of our Party, by the Soviet Government and Comrade Khrushchov to draw the attention of the peoples to the disarmament problem and reveal the danger of a new war. A factor for it is the magnetism of our peace policy, our great plans for communist construction, and our defence might, all of which protect, like a steel shield, the independence of many countries of the world that today boldly

join their voice to ours in calling for peace and disarmament. (*Applause.*) We welcome that voice, which merges with the voice of the Soviet state and its allies in the struggle for disarmament and peace.

I would like to state, Comrade Deputies, that the official visit which I paid to Yugoslavia by decision of the Government to reciprocate the visit which Comrade K. Popović, Foreign Secretary of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, paid the Soviet Union last year, provided further confirmation of the fact that the views of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia on disarmament are essentially identical. Our views on a number of other important world problems either coincide or are akin. This is good, of course, it meets the interests of both countries and of the further development of Soviet-Yugoslav co-operation. (*Applause.*)

Prominent in the Geneva discussions is the problem of banning nuclear tests. This is understandable, for the U.S. Government, as well as the British, brought the Eighteen Nation Committee their own prepared solution of the problem, namely, to carry out the new series of nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere they have scheduled. The sole purpose of their assertions that they desired to end nuclear tests—including the joint statement which the United States and Britain made on April 10 last—was, as Comrade Khrushchov pointed out in his message to Mr. Harold Macmillan, the British Prime Minister, on April 12, to stave off the wrath of the peoples, not to reach agreement. It is fair to say that the U.S. Government's decision to carry out, from the latter half of April onwards, a series of atmospheric nuclear tests in the Pacific area is condemned almost universally.

We see the clear and consistent position of the Soviet Union winning ever greater understanding and support among those who sincerely want to put an end to experimental nuclear explosions. What is the essence of our position? As you know, the Soviet Government has proposed immediately to conclude an agreement ensuring the immediate discontinuance of the testing of all atomic and hydrogen weapons, and to use for control the various countries' national systems of detecting nuclear explosions.

Such an approach makes it possible to end nuclear weapons tests without any further delay, and for ever. It is

based on scientific data tested by experience and practice and indicating that all nuclear explosions can be reliably detected by means of national systems.

Those who are opposed to the discontinuance of nuclear tests maintained something to the contrary, saying that nuclear explosions, particularly underground ones, cannot be detected unless there is a ramified network of international control posts on the territory of the countries concerned and unless whole battalions of international inspectors are sent to those countries. We have known the worth of their contentions in the past as well. Comrade Khrushchov, speaking at the election meeting on March 16, told how those who had kept up a false note on nuclear tests had been shown up for what they were. The Soviet Union carried out an underground explosion. And see what happened. The same day, the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission announced that the United States had recorded the explosion. That was done by means of the national system which the United States has at its disposal and not with the aid of any international inspection groups.

In his Message to the British Prime Minister, Mr. Macmillan, Comrade Khrushchov disproved the assertion that the demand for setting up international reconnaissance posts on our territory was prompted by the desire to promote international confidence. Were the governments of the Western Powers really anxious to promote confidence, there are many problems whose solution would help it, above all general and complete disarmament and the conclusion of an international treaty to that end. But so far there is no sign of the Western Powers advancing to the solution of this problem.

There is good reason to regard the discontinuance of nuclear tests as part of the problem of general and complete disarmament, since it is only in the conditions of general and complete disarmament that the factors which impel countries to manufacture more and more new types of nuclear weapon will finally disappear. In reality, however, this issue has developed into an independent one, and many countries, including the Soviet Union, advocate ending nuclear tests now, without waiting till a treaty on general and complete disarmament is concluded. The Soviet Government is prepared to sign at once an agreement discontinuing

nuclear tests, as we proposed on November 28, 1961, and the Western Powers know well that the Soviet Union would implement such an agreement in good faith.

At the same time, the Western Powers cannot say that they are unaware of the consequences their nuclear tests will have if the Western Powers do carry them out contrary to the will of the peoples. The Soviet Government has warned the United States and Britain in no uncertain terms that the Soviet Union will be compelled to reply to such actions on the part of the Western Powers by testing such new types of its nuclear weapon as may be required under the circumstances to strengthen its security and that of its allies and to preserve peace. (*Applause.*) We will reply in that way to all nuclear tests by the West—in the atmosphere or underground, in outer space or under water. (*Applause.*)

The Soviet Union does not want the nuclear arms race to be either continued or intensified. It wants it to be ended. The overwhelming majority of the countries of the world want the same. This was reaffirmed in Geneva a few days ago, when India, the United Arab Republic, Burma, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Brazil, Mexico and Sweden, alarmed by the intention of the U.S.A. and Britain to carry out a new major series of nuclear explosions in the atmosphere, submitted proposals for the solution of the problem of banning all nuclear tests for all time. Not everything is clear and precise in their proposals, but there can be no doubt about one thing, which is the most important: the proposals of the neutralist countries are prompted by what has been proved both in theory and in practice, namely, that control over the discontinuance of nuclear tests can be exercised by means of national detection systems.

The Soviet Government has carefully examined the proposals of the neutralist countries and has come to the conclusion that they can constitute a useful basis for an agreement on the discontinuance of all nuclear tests. It has therefore declared in favour of making those proposals the basis of subsequent discussions. It is now up to the Western Powers to speak up. There is an impression, however, that they cannot bring themselves to give a positive reply to the proposals of the neutralist countries.

Comrade Deputies, in reporting to the Supreme Soviet on the Geneva negotiations, I must deal specially with a

question which was not on the Committee agenda but nevertheless held a prominent place in the exchange of views at Geneva. Along with the meetings on disarmament at the Palais des Nations there took place Soviet-American meetings and talks on whose content nothing was reported at the time by mutual agreement. Those meetings usually drew crowds of the journalists, and as the press was being kept on a starvation diet with regard to information, journalists attacked the participants in the meetings with the question: "Did you lunch on disarmament or on the German question?"

Now that that round of exchanges of opinions is over, I can say that we "lunched" chiefly on the German problem or, to be precise, we talked about the conclusion of a German peace treaty and normalisation of the situation in West Berlin on that basis.

The Geneva meetings were a continuation of the contacts between the Soviet and U.S. Governments of which Comrade Khrushchov spoke at the election meeting. The talks were useful. As a result, we were able to adopt a joint Soviet-American communiqué pointing out that some progress had been made in ascertaining areas of agreement and areas where there is disagreement.

What lies behind these general formulations? Allow me, on instructions from the Soviet Government, to report to the Supreme Soviet on the stage which the exchange of views with the U.S. Government on a German peaceful settlement has now reached. It should be borne in mind, however, that these discussions are what they call closed in character and that they have not yet been completed, which means that it is premature to mention certain aspects of the questions under discussion.

The present situation—the fact that while seventeen years have passed since the end of the Second World War and major changes have come about in Germany and Europe, a German peace treaty has yet to be concluded—is fraught, as Comrade Khrushchov has repeatedly stressed, with a grave menace of conflicts and clashes between the powers that would have terrible consequences for peace. The Soviet Government's proposals for a German peace treaty are aimed at removing this menace and at safeguarding peace and security in Europe on the basis of a realistic appraisal of

the situation, primarily of the fact that there exist two sovereign German states, the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany.

The Soviet Government has declared on more than one occasion, and we did our best to convince our interlocutors at Geneva, that the best thing to do would be to conclude a single peace treaty with the G.D.R. and the F.R.G., or a separate treaty with each of the two German states if that suited the Western Powers better. It has always stressed that only in the event of the Western Powers themselves shunning an agreed decision of the questions relating to a German peaceful settlement would the Soviet Union and a number of other countries have no choice but to sign—even without agreement with the Western Powers—a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic that, like any other peace treaty, would do away with the survivals of occupation, including those in West Berlin. And if anyone still believes that the Soviet Union can be made to abandon this course and renounce the conclusion of a German peace treaty, he must have lost all sense of reality and is likely to be bitterly disappointed. The Soviet Union stands for peace and a peace treaty. If in view of this policy of the U.S.S.R. anyone were to undertake actions directed against peace, there can be no doubt that they would be repelled with the greatest determination. (*Applause.*)

The statement which Comrade Khrushchov made from the rostrum of the Twenty Second Congress of the C.P.S.U., saying that the Soviet Union does not hold to any fatal deadline for the conclusion of a German peace treaty, was inspired by the desire to facilitate the search for a mutually acceptable arrangement. That step, which the Soviet Union took with due regard to the Soviet-American contacts that had been developing since the Vienna meeting of the heads of government of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A., had its effect also during the subsequent exchange of views on a German peace treaty.

The U.S. Government, like the governments of certain other Western Powers, declares that while it will not be a party to a peace treaty, it wishes to find jointly with us an agreed solution to a number of important problems involved in the elimination of the survivals of the Second World War, including the situation in West Berlin and

access to it. Conversations with Mr. Dean Rusk, the U.S. Secretary of State, showed that there is a desire to seek a rapprochement of the positions of the two parties with due regard to the conditions actually prevailing in Germany, although it is perfectly clear that there are still many obstacles to be overcome.

Specifically, the point at issue is that simultaneously with the conclusion of a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic by the Soviet Union and such other countries as may wish it, an agreed solution should be found to a set of questions arising out of a post-war peaceful settlement. What are those questions? We have listed them.

There is the question of normalising the situation in West Berlin by abolishing the occupation regime there and replacing the occupation troops by the troops of neutral countries or the United Nations for a definite period. In this way West Berlin would be transformed from a military outpost of NATO and a centre of subversion against the G.D.R. and other countries into a free city of peace and security.

There is the question of proper respect for the sovereignty of the German Democratic Republic, failing which no agreement could be reached with the Western Powers on questions they are interested in, as the Soviet Government has stated more than once.

There is the question of giving appropriate legal form to and confirming the existing frontiers of the two German states, including the frontier between the G.D.R. and the F.R.G.

There is the question of not arming either German state with nuclear weapons.

And lastly there is the question of concluding a non-aggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation.

These are the more important questions which must be resolved if the good wishes for the promotion of European peace are to be something more than good wishes. It stands to reason that the Soviet Government has raised these questions with the U.S. side and still raises them, and that they were discussed at Geneva as well. I will refer to them briefly.

There is hardly another spot on the globe where the danger of a conflict between the big powers is as great as in West Berlin—on account of the changes that have occurred since the last war.

The Western authorities in that city try to proceed in such a way as if nothing at all had happened since the surrender of Hitler Germany. It seems that they are still fond of the occupation barriers propped by the occupation troops of the three powers, although life has long since broken up the occupation regime both in the east and the west of the country, a regime which no one had established for ever.

There is no discounting the fact that the land and air communications used for intercourse with West Berlin run across the territory and through the air space of a sovereign state, the German Democratic Republic.

West Berlin is not a part of the F.R.G., and none but the rabid revenge-seekers in West Germany and people who have lost all sense of reality consider it a part or a *Land* of the F.R.G. Nevertheless, the West German authorities continue grossly to interfere in the affairs of the city, and carry on from the territory of West Berlin activities hostile to the G.D.R. and the other socialist countries.

The aim of the Soviet proposal to grant West Berlin the status of a free city is to bring the situation in West Berlin into line with the requirements of today and with the interests of peace in the centre of Europe. Let West Berlin be free in choosing its way of life—the Soviet Union is willing to respect the social system that has taken shape there. Let West Berlin be a viable city with a stable and prosperous economy—the Soviet Union is willing to contribute to this. Let access to West Berlin be unhampered—the Soviet Union says yes, we too are in favour of this.

Let us assume, write some Western press organs with reference to the Geneva talks, that the status of West Berlin will be changed and the city made an independent political unit, a free city. Who will guarantee, they ask us, that its new status will be respected and that Western interests will not be imperilled? And they hasten to add that the presence of U.S., British and French occupation troops in West Berlin is indispensable if agreements are to be put into effect.

Some people are even trying to infer that the decisions adopted by the Allies in Potsdam days authorise the three powers to occupy West Berlin for an indefinite period. To this the Soviet Government replies: the U.S.S.R. has never signed any agreement providing for a perpetual occupation of Germany or West Berlin. All occupation is a temporary development, and the relevant agreements say so in plain terms. Where is the document sanctifying the occupation of West Berlin for an indefinite period? There was no such document, nor could there have been.

As regards the undertaking to conclude a German peace treaty, it is signed by the Soviet Union, as well as by the governments of the United States, Britain and France. And the Soviet Union will not shirk its duty in this matter. *(Applause.)*

The time for occupying German territory is past and the survivals of military occupation must be removed.

Concerning guarantees for West Berlin as an independent political unit, you will recall that the Soviet Government has put forward its own proposals and Comrade Khrushchov repeatedly explained them in person to Western leaders, including the U.S. President, Mr. Kennedy, the British Prime Minister, Mr. Macmillan, and the French President, M. de Gaulle. The Soviet Government proposes as a variant solution of the problem of guarantees that token contingents of neutral or U.N. troops be stationed in West Berlin for a definite period.

The exchange of views at Geneva helped to clarify the question of ensuring unhampered intercourse between West Berlin and the outside world, a matter to which the Western Powers say they attach particular importance. The Soviet Government has clearly shown that this can be done—it is only necessary to agree to observe the generally accepted standards of international law with regard to the German Democratic Republic. In other words, respect for the sovereignty of the G.D.R. is a necessary condition for unhindered access to and exit from West Berlin. Failing this there can be no agreement between us and the West.

Worthy of note as a positive circumstance is the statement of the U.S. side that it sees no obstacle to combining free access to West Berlin with the demand that the sover-

eignty of the German Democratic Republic be respected. That is a step forward.

As you know, Comrade Deputies, from Comrade Ulbricht's speech published in our press, the Government of the G.D.R. has declared that it will be agreeable—provided the troops of the three powers in West Berlin are replaced by neutral or U.N. troops—to the establishment of a special international body concerned with access, which would act as arbitrator in the event of complications over the practical implementation of agreements on free transit to West Berlin. Needless to say that such a body should have neither administrative functions on the territory of the G.D.R., nor interfere in its internal affairs, since that would be incompatible with the sovereignty of the G.D.R. Obviously, in this case as in a number of other cases, the Soviet Union and the G.D.R. showed a desire to bridge the moats separating the views of the two parties on the questions under discussion.

This, in rough outline, is the state of affairs as regards the situation in West Berlin, which must be normalised through the conclusion of a peace treaty.

There is no need to dwell at length on the importance of giving appropriate legal form to and confirming the existing frontiers of the two German states, including the frontier between the G.D.R. and the F.R.G., for this is self-evident.

The Soviet proposal for the conclusion of a German peace treaty maintains that it is impermissible to arm either German state with nuclear weapons. The Government of the G.D.R. itself holds that neither the G.D.R. nor the F.R.G. should have such weapons. As regards Bonn, its appetite for atom and hydrogen bombs shocks even the NATO allies of West Germany and sets them thinking.

One must really forget all about the lessons of history to connive at the Bundeswehr's claim to nuclear weapons. We are certain that when the Soviet Government proposes making a provision that nuclear arms shall not be transferred to either German state directly or through third countries, or through the military organisations of which they are members, it expresses not only the interests of the security of our own people, but also the vital interests of the peoples of all Europe, and not only Europe.

At present we can say that the U.S. side realises the importance of resolving this question. This is a positive fact if, of course, this sign of sound thinking is not outweighed by other tendencies.

Naturally, in exchanging views on post-war settlement, which is to serve as the foundation of European peace, one item on the agenda had to be the question of concluding a non-aggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation. The situation in Europe as a whole, but above all on the territory of the two German states, where the armed forces of NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries are stationed in close proximity to each other, calls for easing or, better still, eliminating the dangers stemming from this proximity.

We may state that during the Soviet-American exchange of views mutual understanding was reached in principle on the need to conclude, in some form or another, a non-aggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation. This is a useful advance.

You may ask, Comrade Deputies, what are, taken as a whole, the results and prospects of the Soviet-American contacts on the questions relating to a German peaceful settlement.

It is too early to sum up the results. Although there are certain signs which give hope that agreement can be reached, the experience we have gained over long years of negotiations with the Western Powers on disputed international issues prompts the Soviet Government to be reserved in its appraisals and forecasts until the matter is concluded.

It was agreed at Geneva that following reports to their respective governments and consultations with their allies the two sides would resume their contacts on the German problem and related questions according to the proper procedure. Of course, we pointed out to our partners that talks are not needed for the sake of talks but for the solution of important international problems on whose settlement the future of the world hinges in large measure.

The Soviet Government thinks it necessary to emphasise that it favours serious negotiations and further contacts with a view to submitting the concrete results of the exchange of views to the heads of government for consideration. If the other side keeps to the same line and proceeds

from a sober appraisal of the situation in Germany and in Europe as a whole, results can be achieved which the peoples look forward to and which would benefit the whole of world development.

Comrade Deputies, such are the main results of the Geneva negotiations on disarmament, the discontinuance of nuclear tests and a German peaceful settlement.

The Soviet Union pursues a peace policy. Every year and, indeed, every month sees not only the beacons of our economic and cultural development plans, but also the beacons of the foreign policy of the Soviet state, whose banner is inscribed with the words "Peace and friendship among the peoples", shine brighter and farther than ever. Our country will continue to follow this tried and tested course under the leadership of the Communist Party, of its Leninist Central Committee and N. S. Khrushchov, First Secretary of the C.C. C.P.S.U., head of the Soviet Government, who daily and directly guide all the foreign policy actions of the Soviet state. (*Applause.*)

Allow me to express confidence that the foreign policy of the Soviet Government on general and complete disarmament, nuclear weapons tests and a German peaceful settlement will be unanimously approved by the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. (*Prolonged applause.*)

**RESOLUTION**  
**OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE U.S.S.R.**  
**ON THE REPORT MADE ON APRIL 25, 1962**  
**BY DEPUTY A. A. GROMYKO,**  
**MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE U.S.S.R.,**  
**ON THE TALKS IN GENEVA**

*(Sittings of the First Session of the Sixth Supreme Soviet  
of the U.S.S.R. Verbatim Record)*

Having heard and considered the report made by Deputy  
A. A. Gromyko, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R.,  
on the talks in Geneva, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.  
*resolves:*

To approve the foreign policy of the Soviet Government.

**ERRATUM**

p. 37,	<i>Reads</i>	<i>Should read</i>
last line	cessation of nuclear weapons be approved.	cessation of nuclear weapons tests be approved.

Зак. 3065

