

TRANSLATED FROM THE RUSSIAN BY W. H. B. ...

SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY

A BRIEF REVIEW
1955-65



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
Moscow 1967

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF AUSTRIA

TRANSLATED FROM THE RUSSIAN BY VIC SCHNEIERSON

Contributors:

V. Israelyan (Chief Editor), Y. Bogush,
V. Brykin, G. Deborin, V. Nikhamin,
I. Ovsyany, A. Stepanov, A. Strelin

FIRST PRINTING 1967

ВНЕШНЯЯ ПОЛИТИКА СССР

На английском языке

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA

POLI 301

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 7

Chapter I. OUR TIME AND THE LENINIST PRINCIPLES
OF FOREIGN RELATIONS 17

Groundwork of Soviet Foreign Policy—17. CPSU Is the Leading Force
in Soviet Foreign Policy—22. Character of the Present Epoch—23.
Growing Influence of the World Socialist System on Social Develop-
ment—26. Break-Up of Colonialism and Its International Impact—28.
Third Stage of the General Crisis of Capitalism—32. Peaceful Coexist-
ence of States with Different Social Systems—36. Possibility of
Preventing Wars in Our Time—40. USSR Combats Imperialism and
Works for Peace and International Co-operation—42.

Chapter II. THE SOVIET UNION WORKS FOR UNITY,
FRIENDSHIP AND CO-OPERATION OF SOCIALIST
COUNTRIES 47

New Type of International Relations—47. Relations Between the USSR
and Other Socialist Countries in the Early Half of the Fifties—50.
Impact of the 20th Congress of the CPSU—54. Fraternal Assistance to
the Hungarian People—56. Negotiations Between Socialist Countries in
1956-57—59. 1957 Moscow Meeting on the Further Strengthening of
the Unity of Socialist Countries—62. Socialist Countries Enter a New
Stage of Development—64. Importance of the 1960 Moscow Meeting—
65. Further Expansion of Economic Co-operation—67. Co-operation in
Strengthening the Defences of the Socialist Countries—69. Cuba's
Entry into the Family of Socialist Nations. Soviet-Cuban Relations—
71. Strengthening of the Unity of Socialist Forces Is the Sacred Duty
of All Communists—75.

Chapter III. THE SOVIET UNION AND THE ASIAN
COUNTRIES 84

Leninist Principles of Relations with the Eastern Countries 84

Foreign Policy of Independent Developing Countries—89. Soviet
Economic Relations with the Developing Countries—91.

USSR Works for the Peace and Security of the Peoples of
the Far East and Southeast Asia 94

Ending the Wars in Korea and Indochina Is a Success for the Peace-
Loving Forces—94. Termination of the State of War and Resumption
of Diplomatic Relations Between the Soviet Union and Japan—99.
Soviet Support of the Korean People's Effort to Reunify Their Country
Peacefully—103. Soviet Union and CPR Efforts to Reclaim Taiwan—

702350

106. Soviet Relations with Southeast Asian States—108. Geneva Conference on Laos—113. Soviet Action to Combat the US Aggression in Vietnam—117. Struggle Against Neo-Colonialist Designs in Southeast Asia—121.

Soviet Union Combats Imperialist Aggression in the Middle East 123

Soviet Proposals for the Peaceful Solution of Middle East Problems—123. Soviet Union Acts to Relieve Suez Crisis—125. Imperialist Aggression Against Egypt. Soviet Stand—127. Soviet Proposals on Shoring Up Peace and Security in the Middle East—130. Collapse of the Imperialist Plot Against Syria (1957)—131. Soviet Stand Against the Anglo-American Intervention in the Lebanon and Jordan—132. Soviet Moves to Consolidate Middle East Peace—134. Soviet Relations with the Arab Countries—139. Soviet Relations with Afghanistan, Turkey and Iran—141.

Chapter IV. THE SOVIET UNION AND THE AFRICAN COUNTRIES 145

African Peoples Fight for Independence 145

Soviet Stand in UN for the Rights of African Peoples—145. Soviet Assistance to the People of Algeria—149.

Soviet Support of the Young African States 151

Western Imperialist Policy in Africa—151. African Countries Seek to Consolidate Their Independence—153. Soviet Stand Against the Imperialist Aggression in the Congo—155. Soviet Attitude to African Unity—159. Soviet Political Co-operation with the African States—161. Soviet Economic Ties with the African Countries—162. Conference of Non-Aligned Countries—165.

Chapter V. THE SOVIET UNION AND THE LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES 168

National Liberation Struggle of Latin American Peoples—168. US Expansionist Policy in Latin America—176. US Political Manoeuvres in Latin America. The Alliance for Progress—184. Inter-Imperialist Contradictions in Latin America—186. Soviet Union and the Latin American Countries—189.

Chapter VI. USSR WORKS FOR THE SOLUTION OF VITAL INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS AND FOR ENDURING PEACE 197

Soviet Efforts in the 1950s to Relieve International Tension and Give a Start to General Disarmament 197

USSR Suggests the Establishment of a System of Collective Security (1954)—197. USSR and the Disarmament Problem. May 10, 1955 Proposals—200. Geneva Summit Conference (July 1955)—203. Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers (1955)—207. Soviet Efforts to Improve Relations with the Great Powers—208. Soviet Proposals on Arms Reduction and Banning of Nuclear Weapons (1956-59)—211. Unilateral Measures of the USSR and Other Socialist Countries in Reducing Their Armed Forces—213. Denuclearisation Proposals of the Socialist Countries—215.

Soviet Union, GDR and Other Socialist States Oppose Revival of German Militarism, Work for a Peace Settlement with

Germany and for a Normalisation of the Situation in West Berlin 218

The Soviet Union and the German Question—218. Soviet Efforts to Conclude a Peace Treaty with Germany—220. Termination of the State of War with Germany (1955)—224. Paris Agreements of 1954 and the Stepped-Up Militarisation of the FRG—226. 20th Congress of the CPSU on the German Problem—230. Conclusion of the State Treaty with Austria—231. Establishment of Diplomatic Relations Between the USSR and FRG (1955)—233. Treaty on Relations Between the USSR and GDR (September 20, 1955)—234. War Danger in Europe Mounts as Militarism Revives in the FRG—235. Soviet Draft of a Peace Treaty, January 10, 1959—237. Soviet Proposal on Normalising the Situation in West Berlin—239. Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers, 1959—240.

Soviet Efforts to Promote an International Détente, Disarmament and Co-operation in the Late 50s and Early 60s . . . 241

Soviet Proposals on General and Complete Disarmament—241. US Aggressive Groups Scuttle Paris Summit Conference—246. New Soviet Disarmament Proposals (June 1960)—249. USSR Champions Peace at 15th UN General Assembly (1960-61)—251. Soviet-American Negotiations (June 1961)—255. Actions of the GDR Government, August 13, 1961—256. 16th General Assembly and the Disarmament Problem—258. Soviet Proposals Submitted to the 18-Nation Committee (March 1962)—260. Soviet-American Exchanges of Opinion on the German Problem—264. Crisis in the Caribbean. USSR Acts to Preserve Peace—266. Moscow Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty—268. Soviet Proposals at the 18th UN General Assembly—269. Soviet Proposal on the Peaceful Accommodation of Territorial Disputes—270. Soviet-GDR Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Co-operation, June 12, 1964—272. NATO Nuclear Force Is a Threat to World Peace—274. Do Not Let Up in the Struggle for Peace and International Security—276. Soviet Efforts to Consolidate the UN as a Peace Instrument—279. USSR Stands in the Van of the Struggle Against Imperialism—281.

INTRODUCTION

This book contains a popular account of the principal Soviet acts of foreign policy in the post-war period. It is meant for the general reader and does not lay claim to being an exhaustive investigation of any international problems. The writers devoted themselves mostly to elucidating the Soviet Union's struggle against imperialism and colonialism, for the triumph of socialism, for the national liberation and the sovereign rights of the peoples, for enduring peace and the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

The second Russian edition, of which this is a translation, appeared in 1965. New, very important events have taken place in the world since its writing, which are naturally omitted. The intenseness of international life is one of the distinctive features of our time. This is quite understandable. The spread of socialist and communist ideas, the immense scale of the national liberation movement, the sharpening of class contradictions in the capitalist countries and other relevant socio-political processes which unfolded in rapid succession have had a strong bearing on the development of international relations. Furthermore, the number of states, the subjects of international relations, is increasing continuously in our time. Today, more than 120 states, twice as many as in the early years after the war, participate to one extent or another in world affairs. Last but not least, modern communications have made the establishment and development of all sorts of contacts between states considerably easier.

The 23rd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union ranks among the most important events that influ-

enced life in the Soviet Union and its foreign policy in the past twelve months. The Congress evidenced that the Leninist foreign policy of the USSR is steady and unshakable, and that the line of the CPSU in foreign affairs is consistent and faithful to principle. The scientifically realistic approach of the CC CPSU and the Soviet Government to the complex developments of international life, the persevering and insistent efforts to resolve the external political tasks of the Soviet state paved the way to a further consolidation of the Soviet Union's international contacts and its greater prestige in the modern world.

The Congress stressed that the foreign policy of the Soviet Union is centred, together with that of the other socialist countries, on securing peaceful conditions for the building of socialism and communism; on cementing the unity and cohesion of the socialist countries, of their friendship and fraternity; on supporting liberation and revolutionary movements, on the development of solidarity and all-round co-operation with the young developing countries; on promoting the principles of the peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems; on repulsing the aggressive imperialist forces and delivering mankind from a new world war.

Lately, the CC CPSU and the Soviet Government have been concentrating more of their attention on the economic development of the USSR, proceeding from a scientific analysis and taking into account the objective laws governing economic development. The recent Soviet measures of improving economic management are a fresh projection of the Leninist principles of socialist construction, based on a combination of material incentives to individuals and on the strong public-mindedness of the Soviet people. The new Soviet five-year economic development plan for 1966-70, adopted by the 23rd Congress, is to secure a big advance in communist construction. This plan provides for a rapid uplift of social production, for its greater efficiency, securing a further considerable expansion of industry, greater productivity of labour, high and stable rates of agricultural development and, by this token, a substantial rise of the living standard in the Soviet Union.

In these five years, the aggregate Soviet social product is to increase by 40 per cent, the main production facilities

by more than 50 per cent, the national income by 38-41 per cent, and the real income per head of population by 30 per cent. In 1970, the Soviet Union will produce approximately 840-850 thousand million kwh of electric power, 345-355 million tons of oil, 124-129 million tons of steel, 62-65 million tons of mineral fertiliser, 7.5-7.7 million television sets and 5.3-5.6 million domestic refrigerators. The grain output will increase 30 per cent.

Absence of war is the principal condition for the effective progress of communist construction. Yet the likelihood of a war has increased of late. The rulers of the United States, and their allies, have greatly strained the international situation. The big offensive launched by the imperialists against the forces of democracy and socialism is highlighted by the aggressive war the United States is waging against the people of Vietnam, and by its escalation, by the interference of US imperialism in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic and other Latin American countries, by the dogged imperialist efforts to split the anti-imperialist front of the peoples, by the efforts to impair the solidarity of the peace-loving forces in various regions of the world, etc. Mankind could well have been plunged into the abyss of war by now if the forces of imperialist aggression were not restrained by the might of the Soviet Union, all the socialist countries and other peace-loving states, and by the consistently peaceful Soviet foreign policy. As heretofore; all the acts of Soviet foreign policy in 1965 and 1966 were prompted by the wish to avert a war and reinforce the security of nations. At the 20th UN General Assembly, the Soviet Government submitted two important projects dealing with the two most urgent problems of contemporary international affairs. The first was a draft for a Declaration on the Impermissibility of Interference in the Internal Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty. The project urged the General Assembly to issue an earnest call to all states forthwith to cease, and in future refrain from, any actions representing armed or any other interference in the internal affairs of other states, and any other actions aimed against the righteous struggle of peoples for national independence and freedom. It called on "all states to take guidance in their international relations in the principle of mutual respect and non-interfer-

ence in internal affairs for any motive, whether economic, political or ideological". The Soviet project was a reassertion in more specific terms of the United Nations Charter provisions obliging UN members to refrain in their international dealings from the threat or use of force and prohibiting any and all interference in the internal affairs of states. The stipulations of the Soviet project were also consistent with the decisions of the non-aligned countries, including the states of Asia and Africa, passed at the Bandung, Belgrade and Cairo conferences and aimed against the imperialist policy of interference and aggression.

The ideas contained in the projected Soviet declaration flowed from the very essence of socialist foreign policy. They drew on a realistic appreciation of the processes unfolding in the world today and on the chief trends observed in the foreign policy of the imperialist states, primarily the United States. The Soviet project won overwhelming support in the United Nations, and 57 Asian, African and Latin American countries became co-authors of its final text which was passed by a vast majority vote.

The other important project submitted by the Soviet Government to the 20th UN General Assembly was the draft of a Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Although the non-proliferation problem is by no means new, it has been made more complicated recently by the larger number of countries capable of manufacturing nuclear weapons, and still more so by the intention of the Western powers to create a NATO nuclear force in which the West German revenge-seekers, who are clamouring for an armed revision of the map of Europe, are to have a front seat.

The Soviet non-proliferation treaty draft stipulated that states possessing nuclear weapons should undertake to refrain from putting these weapons in any shape or form—directly or indirectly, through third parties or groups of states—into the possession or at the disposal of states or groups of states that do not possess nuclear weapons, and to refrain from granting these states or groups of states the right to participate in the possession, disposal or use of nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union suggested that signatories to the treaty who do not possess nuclear weapons should, for their part,

undertake not to develop, manufacture or prepare for the manufacture of nuclear weapons either on their own or in collaboration with other states, either in their own territory or in the territory of other countries, and not to seek access to nuclear weapons in any shape or form—directly or indirectly, through third parties or groups of states.

The nearly four-weeks-long discussion at the 20th General Assembly proved that the Soviet initiative was fruitful. It was backed by more than 90 UN member-countries. The General Assembly passed a resolution urging all governments to expedite the conclusion of an international treaty without such loopholes as could enable "nuclear or non-nuclear powers to disseminate, directly or indirectly, nuclear weapons in any form".

New important proposals designed to firm up international security, were also submitted by the Soviet Government to the 21st UN General Assembly. Due to the fact that the Western powers, primarily the United States, are seeking to defy the clearly expressed recommendations of the 20th General Assembly and secure loopholes in the non-proliferation treaty for ultimate access to nuclear weapons of non-nuclear NATO member-countries, above all the Federal Republic of Germany, the Soviet Government proposed that the 21st General Assembly appeal to all states to abandon actions impeding agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Furthermore, the Soviet Union submitted drafts of resolutions concerning the implementation of the declarations on non-interference and the dismantlement of foreign war bases in the Asian, African and Latin American countries, which are purposed to promote practical measures easing international tension.

It is one of the prime tasks of Soviet foreign policy to strengthen the socialist community, the unity and cohesion of the socialist countries, on the basis of proletarian internationalism. Relations between the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries have become much more lively of late, marked by earnest discussions of matters of mutual interest. Shed of fanfare and ostentation, Soviet contacts with the socialist countries have helped to analyse the current situation objectively and exhaustively, to surmount difficulties encountered in the process of socialist

construction, and to resolve all problems in the interest of the socialist community as a whole, as well as that of each individual socialist country, on a basis of equality and non-interference in each other's internal affairs. In the course of 1966, Party, Government and parliamentary delegations headed by leaders of the CPSU and top Soviet statesmen visited nearly all the socialist countries. For their part, delegations of many socialist countries visited the Soviet Union. In their talks, the Party leaders and statesmen devoted much of their attention to co-ordinating the foreign policy of the socialist states. For all the complex and contradictory nature of contemporary international relations, they have borne out convincingly that the foreign policy and diplomacy of the socialist countries plays an immense role as an active and independent factor of world politics. The leaders of the socialist countries also discussed further co-operation, expansion of friendly contacts, a wide range of international questions and the situation in the world communist movement.

Facing up to the fresh aggressive gambles of the imperialists, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries devoted due attention to military co-operation and took measures to reinforce their defence potential. The Bucharest conference of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Treaty countries in July 1966 highlighted a fresh expansion of co-operation among the socialist countries. The conference made an exhaustive analysis of the prevailing world situation and framed a set of concrete proposals whose implementation could have a most favourable effect on the future of mankind.

Important negotiations between Soviet statesmen and the leaders of many Asian and African countries took place in 1965 and 1966. Pride of place at these parleys went to tasks prompted by social developments, such as the further consolidation of the revolutionary forces of our time in the struggle against US aggression, against imperialism and colonialism of all shapes, and against racism, that offspring of the man-hating ideology of imperialism. In reference to the US aggression in Vietnam, which is a grave threat to peace, a joint Soviet-Egyptian communique said in the autumn of 1965: "Both sides declare that the bombing of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam has got to cease forth-

with and the 1954 Geneva Agreements have got to be observed."

In extending their contacts with the African and Asian leaders, Soviet statesmen attach great importance to the role of the newly free countries in current international relations. In the interest of the common struggle against imperialism, Soviet diplomacy studies the proposals and recommendations of the independent Asian, African and Latin American countries most closely, and accepts them frequently as a groundwork for further negotiations. On many occasions, Soviet representatives at international organisations and conferences withdrew their own proposals and agreed to amendments or compromise projects submitted by independent Asian, African or Latin American countries on the assumption that the passage of the compromise proposal will, in the final analysis, serve the struggle against imperialism and colonialism. At the 20th General Assembly, for example, the Soviet Union backed the resolution co-authored by the United Arab Republic, India, Burma, Mexico, Ethiopia, Nigeria and a few other non-aligned countries, calling on the 18-Nation UN Disarmament Committee to expedite "the negotiation of an international treaty banning the proliferation of nuclear weapons".

The Soviet Union is a convinced supporter of African unity and Afro-Asian solidarity. It favours the idea of convening a second Afro-Asian conference of heads of state or government, which would reaffirm and develop the principles adopted at the 1955 Bandung Conference and, moreover, work out a joint Afro-Asian platform in relation to the more important contemporary international issues. The Soviet Union announced its readiness to participate in the conference and to work in every way for its success. The preparations for the conference and the meeting of the Foreign Ministers of 45 states in late October and early November 1965 in Algiers, revealed that the overwhelming majority of the Afro-Asian states attaches great importance to co-operation with the Soviet Union in safeguarding the freedom and independence of the peoples and in maintaining world security. The question of the Soviet Union's participation in the Afro-Asian conference was viewed in a positive light at the Foreign Ministers' meeting. The

Soviet Government treated with understanding the decision of the Foreign Ministers to postpone the conference, considering that the time of the conference has to be set by the majority of the Afro-Asian countries in conformance with the specific situation.

When the armed conflict broke out on the Indo-Pakistani frontier in the autumn of 1965 and the situation in South Asia grew explosive, the Soviet Union declared its wish to assist a swift settlement of the armed conflict between India and Pakistan and applied its energies to stop the bloodshed. By its consistent and fair attitude, the substance of which was set out in messages of the head of the Soviet Government to the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan, in TASS statements and other documents, the Soviet Union helped to restore peace in South Asia and frustrated the forces that wished to intervene and blow up the conflict.

Acting on its firm conviction that peaceful and good-neighbour relations accord with the basic national interests of the peoples of India and Pakistan, the interests of peace in Asia and the rest of the world, the Soviet Union offered in messages of September 17, 1965, its good services in organising a meeting of the top leaders of the two countries in Tashkent or any other Soviet city. If the two countries so wished, the messages said, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR would participate in the conversations. The proposal of the Soviet Government was duly accepted and the Tashkent Conference in early 1966 proved an important phase in the accommodation of the Indo-Pakistani conflict. The Tashkent Conference, its results and the acclaim sounded all over the world, testified to the deep trust enjoyed by the peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet state and to its enormous prestige.

International developments in 1965 and 1966 bore out again the practical significance of the peaceful coexistence policy in the day-to-day handling of the relations the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries maintain with the countries of the old world. Taking note of mutual interests and analysing international affairs, the Soviet Union worked for normal diplomatic relations with the capitalist states and strove to settle all questions in dispute on a realistic basis. What the Soviet Government accomplished in this

context has given rise lately to new factors of stability on the international scene.

The advancement of good-neighbour relations and co-operation with the Scandinavian countries and Finland, with the southern neighbours of the USSR, with France and Italy, and with other states, is fresh evidence that the Leninist policy of peace and peaceful coexistence is effective and viable.

At the same time, the Soviet Government has announced repeatedly that co-operation with colonialists old and new is out of the question. The Soviet Union will not co-operate with any capitalist power that commits aggressive acts against any other country and thereby undermines world peace and the security of the peoples.

"Our Party and our Government," said the Report of the CC CPSU to the 23rd Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, "categorically reject the absurd standpoint that the Great Powers can build up their relations at the expense of the interests of other countries and peoples. All countries, big and small, have the same right that their sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity should be respected. And nobody has the liberty to violate this right."¹

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states rests invariably on a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the international situation and reflects the communist ideology.

Firmness and adherence to principle in upholding the Marxist-Leninist foundations of the political course followed by the Soviet state, realism and a profoundly scientific approach to all the exigencies of international life, flexibility and sense of purpose in settling the practical issues of world politics—these are the cornerstones of Soviet foreign policy.

¹ 23rd Congress of the CPSU, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1966, pp. 45-46.

CHAPTER I

OUR TIME AND THE LENINIST PRINCIPLES OF FOREIGN RELATIONS

Groundwork of Soviet Foreign Policy

The October 1917 Revolution ended the rule of capitalists and landowners in Russia and ushered in a new era in world history. After the armed uprising triumphed in Petrograd, the Communist Party and the Soviet Government lost no time launching an entirely new home and foreign policy, whose rudiments had been worked out by Vladimir Lenin long before the socialist revolution to conform with the interests and aspirations of the people.

Soviet foreign policy is contingent on the socialist character of the Soviet social and political system, the leading role in society of the Soviet Communist Party and the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

How you treat the problems of foreign policy and the question of war and peace, Lenin stressed, depends on what class you belong to. Creative application of Marxism in each concrete situation and a level-headed appraisal of the balance of strength in the world arena have enabled the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to work out optimally correct solutions for these crucial problems.

The leading principles of Soviet foreign policy were defined in the Decree on Peace, one of the earliest government documents. That it laid the accent on peace was evidence enough that socialism and peace were inseparable. The Soviet Republic branded imperialist wars as a crime against humanity and called on all nations to work assiduously for lasting world peace.

The Decree on Peace proclaimed the following genuinely democratic standards of international intercourse: respect

for the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of countries and peoples, the right of all nations to an independent political existence, impermissibility of any and all interference in the internal affairs of peoples and states, equality of nations big and small, repudiation of aggression and territorial annexion, and broad international economic and cultural co-operation.

From the hour of its establishment, the Soviet state has opposed imperialism and its policy of aggression and colonial enslavement, supported the revolutionary movement of the working class and the national liberation struggle of the peoples, and strove to unite all existing revolutionary forces.

Soviet diplomacy followed Lenin's basic principle that the "main task is to oppose imperialism, a struggle in which we have got to win".¹ Support of peoples fighting for liberation from imperialism and for the maintenance of revolutionary gains has been one of the cornerstones of Soviet foreign policy.

The Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia, published on November 16, 1917, soon after the Decree on Peace, and the appeal, "To All Working Moslems of Russia and the East", dated December 3, 1917, set out Lenin's far-sighted propositions on the national and colonial questions. For the first time, the government of a Great Power officially denounced the colonial system. For the first time, too, a political programme was put forward that envisaged the practical implementation of the principle of the self-determination of nations.

The young Soviet Republic, the RSFSR, helped the other republics formed on the territory of the former Russian Empire in fighting foreign imperialists and the counter-revolutionaries. It was this common struggle for freedom and national revival, for the maintenance of revolutionary gains, that forged the fraternal relations which paved the way for the merger of the Soviet republics in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in 1922.

Neither did Soviet Russia fall down on its duty of assisting, to the full extent of its resources, the Soviet republics that sprang up in other European countries, such as the

¹ Lenin, *Collected Works*, 5th Russ. ed., Vol. 37, p. 124.

Hungarian Soviet Republic, the Bavarian Soviet Republic and the Slovak Soviet Republic. Besides, Soviet Russia gave considerable support to Mongolia, where a popular regime was established in 1921. Thus, the foundation of international socialist relations, based on the principles of proletarian internationalism, was laid under Lenin's guidance soon after the October Revolution, although, for understandable reasons, the headway achieved at the time was meagre.

The Leninist principle of supporting the liberation struggles of the peoples against imperialism materialised in concrete Soviet Government acts. To begin with the Soviet Government gave up all claims to rights and privileges in China stipulated in various agreements imposed by the tsarist government; it also abrogated the unequal treaties which tsarist Russia had imposed on Iran, Turkey and other countries, and thus assisted the struggle of the Eastern peoples against imperialism.

Some time before the October Revolution Lenin drew the conclusion that socialism would not replace capitalism overnight. The replacement, he wrote, would take an entire historical epoch, in which states with different social systems would continue to exist side by side. And, he held, they would inevitably have to maintain political, economic and cultural relations.

The Leninist theory of socialist revolution is, thus, the scientific basis of the policy of peaceful coexistence.

Lenin pointed out that not only the socialist states, but the capitalist ones too, had a stake in developing international economic contacts and commerce. This is why, he showed, peaceful coexistence had a sound economic foundation. "I see no reason why a socialist state like ours cannot have unlimited business relations with the capitalist countries," he said in 1920. "We are not opposed to using capitalist-made locomotives and farm machines; so why should they object to using our socialist wheat, flax and platinum?"¹

From the very first, the Leninist principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems became one of the cornerstones of Soviet foreign policy. A Foreign

¹ Lenin, *Collected Works*, 5th Russ. ed., Vol. 40, p. 152.

Affairs Commissariat report to the All-Russia Central Executive Committee in June 1920, said:

"Our motto was and still is the same: peaceful coexistence with other governments, whatever they may be. The facts confront us and other states with the necessity of establishing continuous relations between our workers' and peasants' government and the capitalist governments."¹

The policy of peaceful coexistence does not rule out opposition to imperialist aggression or support of peoples fighting against foreign oppression for their freedom and independence. On the contrary, it presupposes the one and the other. The Soviet Union maintains by word and deed that lasting peace on earth is possible, provided the sovereign rights of every nation are properly respected.

Soviet foreign policy is built on the principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. But the scope of Soviet international relations goes much farther. Lenin predicted the time when more than one socialist state would appear on earth and foresaw that the number of socialist states would grow steadily, giving thought to the principles that would govern their mutual relations. Furthermore, the Soviet people stand by the working people in the capitalist states and the oppressed peoples in colonial and dependent countries, and help them in their revolutionary and liberation struggle. All this shapes relations basically different from the antagonistic class relations between states of different social systems. *The relations with other socialist states, with the working people of the capitalist countries and the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries follow the principles of proletarian internationalism.*

Relations between socialist states are also governed by standards of democratic international intercourse: equality, mutual respect of sovereign rights and interests, respect of territorial integrity and independence, non-interference in each other's domestic affairs, etc. But this is not all. Friendship, unity, fraternal assistance and the co-operation of the peoples of the socialist countries are the other key principles of proletarian internationalism.

¹ *Dokumenty vneshnei politiki SSSR*, Vol. II, Gospolitizdat, 1958, p. 639.

Proletarian internationalism has always been an innate quality of the working class. It expressed the craving of workers of different countries for unity and joint struggle against capital. The motto of *The Communist Manifesto*, "Workers of all countries, unite!" has been the workers' motto at all times.

Before socialism emerged beyond the frontiers of one country, proletarian internationalism was epitomised in Soviet foreign policy by solidarity with the working people of the capitalist countries and by support of the national liberation struggles of the peoples and progressive forces all over the world. It was not until other countries embarked on the socialist path that the other aspect of proletarian internationalism namely, fraternal friendship and comradesly mutual assistance of peoples free from exploitation, gained its full weight.

Proletarian internationalism pervades all Soviet domestic and foreign policy. This is due not only to their organic unity, but also to the fact that the constructive labour of the Soviet people has a strong international impact. This was true of the early years of Soviet power, and it is just as true today.

The growth of Soviet economic and military might speeds the world revolutionary process and reinforces the Soviet Union as the bulwark of mankind's liberation movement, exercising a strong influence on the minds of millions upon millions of people.

The successes of communist construction in the USSR make the whole socialist system stronger and produce favourable prospects of transition to communism for countries belonging to the socialist system. The peoples of the Soviet Union are blazing the trail to communism for all mankind.

Soviet foreign policy is designed to secure peaceful conditions for the building of socialism and communism, to cement the unity and cohesion of the socialist countries, to support the liberation and revolutionary movements, to promote solidarity and co-operation with the independent Asian, African and Latin American countries, and to further the principles of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. The Soviet Union has been

doing its utmost all these years to frustrate imperialist schemes of aggression and to deliver mankind from a new world war.

CPSU Is the Leading Force in Soviet Foreign Policy

Foreign relations are treated as an important sphere by the Soviet Communist Party and the Soviet Government. The principles of foreign policy are part and parcel of the Communist Party's programme, strategy and tactics. Lenin stressed the importance of Party guidance in foreign policy and demanded that such guidance should be continuous and concrete. He considered it an earnest of socialist success.

In his article, "Better Fewer, But Better", Lenin wrote: "Does not the Political Bureau discuss from the Party point of view many questions, both minor and important, concerning 'moves' we should make in reply to 'moves' of foreign powers in order to forestall their, say, cunning, if we are not to use a less respectable term? Is not this flexible amalgamation of a Soviet institution with a Party institution a source of great strength in our politics?"¹

For Lenin collective leadership was the prime principle of Party life. He considered it necessary to discuss questions of foreign policy and the international situation at Party congresses, Central Committee plenums and other Party functions. The foreign policy of the USSR is shaped by the collective intellect of the Party. The CPSU sums up the historical experience not only of the Soviet Union, but of the world communist and working-class movement. Soviet foreign policy, shaped and directed by the Communist Party, is therefore highly principled and ideologically sound, scientifically grounded and morally pure. At the same time, it is pliable and realistic.

After the victory of socialism became not only complete, but also final, the Soviet Union was ready to pass to the second, higher phase of communism—classless communist society. The giant economic and political tasks this involved, and their proper solution, could not be grasped from any

¹ Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, pp. 495-96.

but the creative positions of Marxism-Leninism, intolerant of dogmatism and revisionism.

The 20th Congress of the CPSU was of immense importance in this respect. It condemned the Stalin cult and concentrated the Party's attention on restoring and developing the Leninist standards of Party life and leadership. Its decisions gave scope to the creative energies of the Soviet people, invigorated the links between the Party and people, and added to the Party's fighting capacity. It enriched Marxist-Leninist theory and the strategy and tactics of communism with conclusions that fitted the needs of the time and the new tasks. It defined determinative propositions of Soviet foreign policy.

The decisions of the October and November (1964) plenums of the CC CPSU were added proof that the Communist Party and the Soviet Government would not tolerate subjectivism in politics and were determined to proceed undeviatingly along the Leninist course.

Soviet foreign policy today has the same features that it had when Lenin stood at the head of the Party and state. These features are: deep-going Marxist analysis of international events, strict adherence to principle, boldness and pliability, revolutionary firmness in safeguarding the interests of the state and readiness to make reasonable and mutual compromises when the situation demands. Soviet peaceful policies are now more active and their influence on the development of international relations in the interest of the peoples more palpable.

The Soviet conduct of world affairs is a big help to the world revolutionary movement and the struggle of the peoples against imperialism, for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism.

Character of the Present Epoch

The prime theoretical question, whose correct appreciation is of cardinal importance for the making of Soviet foreign policy, is the question of the character of the epoch. To comprehend the character of the epoch is to lay bare its specific laws, the purport and magnitude of current developments and their ultimate trend. The Com-

munists base their revolutionary and constructive activities on a deep knowledge of the objective laws governing the process of history. This is why they attach so much importance to analysing the epoch.

Lenin, for one, never tired of stressing the need for analysing from the Marxist standpoint the social, economic and other developments in the life of society. "The historic events that are unfolding before our eyes," he wrote, "can be understood only if we analyse, in the first place, the objective conditions of the transition from one epoch to the other. . . . We can and do know *which class* stands at the hub of one epoch or another, determining its main content, the main direction of its development, the main characteristics of the historical situation in that epoch, etc. Only on that basis, i.e., by taking into account, in the first place, the fundamental distinctive features of the various 'epochs' . . . can we correctly evolve our tactics."¹

The character of our epoch was examined at the 20th and 22nd congresses of the CPSU. The Communist Party expanded on Lenin's definition of the present epoch and made an exhaustive and deep analysis of its features. "Our epoch," says the Programme of the CPSU, "whose main content is the transition from capitalism to socialism, is an epoch of struggle between the two opposing social systems, an epoch of socialist and national liberation revolutions, of the breakdown of imperialism and the abolition of the colonial system, an epoch of transition of more and more peoples to the socialist path, of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world-wide scale. The central factor of the present epoch is the international working class and its main creation the world socialist system."²

The modern epoch was ushered in by the heroic exploit of the workers and peasants of revolutionary Russia, who in October 1917, led by the Bolshevik Party, opened the era of the liberation of man from exploitation. And it will culminate in the full victory of communism all over the world, ushering in a new epoch, whose contemporaries will know no more about capitalism and exploitation of man by man than what they read in books.

¹ Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 145.

² *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, 1961, p. 449.

From the standpoint of its chief motive forces, the period after October 1917 breaks distinctly into two stages.

In the first stage—from the October Revolution to the emergence of socialism beyond the frontiers of one country—the foremost social system existed in the USSR only, which was surrounded by hostile capitalist states. This was a time in which the dictatorship of the proletariat took root and developed within the national framework of one state and was as yet incapable of decisively influencing world politics. Although the influence of the Soviet state was strong from the very beginning, it was not economically and militarily powerful enough. For all this, the imperialists were unable to crush the world's first working people's state, the centre of attraction of the world's progressive forces. True, the danger of capitalist restoration by a foreign intervention was not yet dissipated. This is why the victory of socialism in the USSR could not then be considered final.

Combating immense difficulties, made doubly grave by the capitalist encirclement, the Soviet people built socialist society and showed the world the impressive advantages of the new system. During the Great Patriotic War of 1941-45, the nation safeguarded its country and its socialist gains from the most sinister force of imperialist reaction and brought liberation from fascism and militarism to many European and Asian peoples, helping them subsequently to embark on socialism. The October Revolution had broken just one of the links of the imperialist chain, whereas now a frontal break-through was accomplished.

At this stage, the dictatorship of the proletariat spread beyond the borders of one country and became international. Socialism grew into a world system, which began exercising an increasing influence on international affairs. Although imperialism is still dominant in a part of the world, its positions have been substantially shaken, and its disgraceful colonial system is crumbling fast. Socialism has become the greatest motive power of our time.

The second stage of our epoch has begun.

The new socialist states have rapidly won a firm footing. They have upheld their revolutionary gains and shown

the decisive advantages of the new system over the capitalist.

Today, no power on earth can restore capitalism in the USSR or break up the socialist community.

Growing Influence of the World Socialist System on Social Development

The emergence of socialism beyond the borders of one country and its growth into a world system has become the principal feature of our time. The socialist world stretches from the Elbe in the west to the shores of the Pacific Ocean in the east and from the Arctic Ocean to the southern seas. It prevails in 26 per cent of the world's territory and accounts for 35 per cent of the world's population, or for more than 1,000 million people.

The socialist countries are exercising a strong influence on world development by their economic successes. Socialism holds the lead in rates of economic growth, and its share in the world's industrial and agricultural output is rising steadily.

In 1963, industrial production in the developed capitalist countries exceeded that of 1950 by a mere 89 per cent, while that of the socialist countries had risen 330 per cent. In some industrial fields the Soviet Union has forged into first place. The socialist countries account for 38 per cent of the world's industrial output today, whereas in 1950 they accounted for just 20 per cent. The standard of living in the socialist countries is rising. The ideology and moral code of socialist society, which promote truly humane relations among men, are winning ever greater popularity the world over.

These successes, which furnish graphic proof of the advantages of the new social system, are an inspiration for the peoples.

The influence of the world socialist system on the course of world events is increasing continuously. The prediction made by Lenin that socialism would grow into a force "capable of exercising a decisive influence upon world politics as a whole"¹ has come true. The 22nd Congress of

¹ Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 148.

the CPSU noted in its resolution that "today it is socialism, not imperialism, that determines the main trend of world development".¹

The growing economic and defensive potential of the socialist countries has multiplied the material and moral factors that make it possible to safeguard world peace. No longer can the imperialists settle the key international problems their own way.

All this means that in the contemporary world socialism with its ideals of peace and progress, rather than imperialism with its predatory urges, is the decisive factor of social development.

No longer does imperialism play the dominant role in international affairs. The influence of the socialist system, of the newly independent countries and the people in the capitalist states, is growing. This is paving the way for the new principles of international relations and diplomacy advocated by socialism, and defeating the principles of aggressive imperialist policy.

Ideals of peace and international friendship have been prominent in various joint diplomatic documents issued by the socialist countries. They prevail in the relations between the countries of the world socialist system. Communist views on international relations and world politics have also affected the policies of the newly independent states.

The fact that imperialism has grown weaker does not mean that it has become less aggressive. In its desperate efforts to retain and extend its positions, it resorts to most dubious and dangerous means. The US military escalation in Vietnam, the intervention in the Dominican Republic, armed interference in the Congo and other similar acts against peace and humanity reveal the beastly nature of modern imperialism, which scorns all the standards of international law.

Not only are the acts of the socialist states in the world arena progressive in spirit, irreconcilable in exposing aggressive imperialist policies and manoeuvres of distraction, and conclusive in combating the imperialist aggressors. The socialist countries have put forward numerous

¹ *The Road to Communism*, p. 412.

constructive proposals that take into account the existing situation and are designed to invigorate international co-operation.

Break-Up of Colonialism and Its International Impact

The other distinctive feature of our epoch is the break-up of the colonial system. Its inception is part and parcel of the development of capitalism. The enslavement and plunder of India, Indonesia and many other countries was an essential source of enrichment for the bourgeoisie of Western Europe at the dawn of the capitalist era. In the scramble for markets and raw materials the Great Powers completed the territorial division of the world at the turn of the century and forcibly took possession of most of the Asian and African countries. The few Eastern states that retained their political independence were reduced to the status of semi-colonies. The imperialists controlled their economy and finance, and their domestic and foreign policy. "Capitalism," wrote Lenin, "has grown into a world system of colonial oppression and of the financial strangulation of the overwhelming majority of the population of the world by a handful of 'advanced' countries."¹

The monopolies reaped fabulous profits by exploiting the colonies. Colonial resources and manpower were a source of strength in their fight against the revolutionary movement and in their pursuit of predatory policies. The oppressed colonial peoples, on the other hand, reaped nothing but suffering, political disfranchisement, economic and cultural backwardness, poverty and extinction. Time and again, they rose up against their tormentors, but, as a rule, suffered failure.

It was not until the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution that the situation changed. The Revolution undermined the pillars of imperialism and touched off the breakdown of the colonial system. The Revolution roused the oppressed nations and redoubled their craving for independence and their faith in being able to defeat imperialism.

¹ Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 191.

The Soviet victory over the nazis in the Great Patriotic War and, particularly, the contribution of the Soviet troops to the defeat of the armed forces of Japan, were immensely important, even crucial, for the peoples' struggle in the East. The People's Republic of China, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Korean People's Democratic Republic freed themselves forever from imperialist oppression and embarked on the building of socialism. India, Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon, Syria, the Lebanon and other countries got rid of colonial rule and started on independent development.

The emergence and consolidation of the socialist system created favourable conditions for the complete and final abolition of colonialism, that disgrace to mankind. "Imperialism suppressed the national independence and freedom of the majority of the peoples and put the fetters of brutal colonial slavery on them," says the Programme of the CPSU, "*but the rise of socialism marks the advent of the era of emancipation of the oppressed peoples. A powerful wave of national liberation revolutions is sweeping away the colonial system and undermining the foundations of imperialism.*"¹

In the past, just a few political leaders and the most politically awake sections of society were the only ones to oppose the colonial system. Later, entire nations mounted a decisive attack on their oppressors. The organisation and unity of the anti-imperialist forces became increasingly effective. The struggle engulfed whole continents. In many countries, members of the national bourgeoisie joined in the fight, because they were eager to drive out the colonialists, with the effect that the latter had to contend with a united anti-colonial front. To be sure, the national bourgeoisie is unstable and inclined towards reconciliation with imperialism and feudalism. The extent of its involvement in the liberation revolution depends on the relation of class forces within the country and the sharpness of its contradictions with the imperialists and feudals.

The colonial peoples have a stake in winning independence with the least sacrifice in lives and property. They prefer to end foreign rule by peaceful means. But whenever

¹ *The Road to Communism*, p. 490.

the imperialists scorn their just demands, they employ all possible forms of struggle, not short of armed uprisings and wars of liberation. In the first post-war decade the colonial regime was abolished by agreement between the metropolitan countries and national organisations in just three countries. About a dozen others attained independence by force of arms. In the next ten years, however, 34 of 36 states won independence without resort to arms. By relinquishing their rule over colonies before matters reached the point of armed conflict, the colonialists hoped to retain their foothold and hand power to their own protégés. All the same, their dodge was no more than a forced retreat in face of the liberation movement.

In 1939, the colonies had a population of some 700 million or one-third of the aggregate population of the capitalist world. By 1965, the figures shrank to about 40 million and approximately 1.5 per cent, respectively. After the war, over 60 new states emerged in place of the former colonies. The break-up of the colonial system entered its stage of culmination.¹

In the present circumstances, even the smaller and weaker states have every opportunity, after winning political independence, to overcome the aftermaths of colonial rule, develop their economy and improve the living conditions of their people in a fairly quick time, because they have the support of the socialist countries.

The practical acts of the newly liberated countries have already acquired a certain pattern: agrarian reform with the free transfer of land to the peasants; extirpation of semi-feudal methods of exploitation and of the dominance of local feudals; restriction and nationalisation of foreign companies, attended by the abolition of semi-colonial exploitation and imperialist economic control; creation of a national industry, chiefly within the state sector, coupled

¹ The rate and extent of the process of break-up is illustrated by the following data concerning the possessions of the imperialist powers:

	1939	1955	1965
Area (in mln. sq km) . . .	38.3	29.4	8.5
Population (mln.)	688	195.7	about 40

with restrictions on the local bourgeoisie; development of farming through the peasant co-operative movement and state-sponsored use of modern science and technology; promotion of national culture and training of local specialists in the essential fields of science, engineering, production and management; pursuit of a progressive foreign policy envisaging the maintenance of peace, struggle against colonialism, and friendship with the socialist countries, all this securing an international climate for independent development; rallying and encouraging the revolutionary activity of the people, without which it is impossible to quell the resistance of domestic reactionaries and foreign imperialists. This programme, once carried through, implies the fulfilment of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal democratic revolution.

It is only natural that the peoples of the newly free countries reject the painful road of bourgeois "progress" and advocate solution of national tasks by revolutionary anti-capitalist methods. Both the domestic and international situation of the young states is favourable for this. The bourgeoisie of most of the developing countries is economically weak and poorly organised. In many countries it has not even grown into a distinct class, whereas considerable numbers of workers already exist. The efforts of the reactionary bourgeois groups to solicit imperialist support isolate them and prompt the progressive sections of the bourgeoisie to seek co-operation with the people. The working people of the new states have the support of the socialist system. This enables them to press forward anti-capitalist measures despite the resistance and threats of the imperialists.

Non-capitalist development resolves the tasks of the democratic revolution speedily and paves the way for the subsequent transition to the building of socialism. The transition to non-capitalist development is best achieved through the establishment and development of *national democracy*, based politically on a bloc of all the progressive patriotic forces that favour true independence and democracy. This is not a theoretical assumption. Algeria, the United Arab Republic, Mali, Burma and other countries have already carried out radical democratic reforms, restricted the development of the bourgeoisie and national-

ised the property of the big and medium capitalists. Syria and a number of African countries have taken measures likely to lead to non-capitalist development.

The choice of method is being made by the newly free countries in an environment of acute class struggle. Imperialism intervenes actively on the side of domestic reaction. But the mass of the people are learning by their own experience that the non-capitalist path is the only one that can solve the national problems in their favour, and are coming out with mounting vehemence against the intrigues of the home reactionaries and their imperialist backers. The people's struggle for non-capitalist development is a prominent feature of the present stage of the national liberation movement.

The formation of the world socialist community and the entry of the young national states into world politics has changed the balance of forces. The objective possibilities for the imperialists to carry through an aggressive policy have shrunk. The imperialists are compelled to withdraw their troops and evacuate their military bases from many of the liberated countries. No longer can they plunder with impunity the raw materials and strategic resources of the former colonies. This, for one, makes it more difficult for them to prepare and start their military ventures. The monopolists have also lost the opportunity of directing the economic development of the young states in their own interest, although they still have a strong grip on them. As the young states build up their national industries, their dependence on foreign monopolies will decrease still more.

In brief, after putting an end to the direct political control of the Western powers, the Asian and African countries have stopped being a reserve and backyard of imperialism. The invigoration of their political and economic independence objectively furthers the general weakening of imperialism.

Third Stage of the General Crisis of Capitalism

The radical changes on the international scene caused the general crisis of capitalism to pass to its second and, later, third stage.

The general crisis of capitalism is an all-embracing process. It involves all aspects of bourgeois society, its internal and foreign policy, and its ideology.

The first stage of the general crisis of capitalism was touched off by the First World War and the October 1917 Revolution. The second stage broke out during the Second World War and the years of socialist revolutions in a number of European and Asian countries. The third stage began in the mid-fifties.

This third stage was ushered in by the successes of the socialist countries in all spheres of life. The other reason for it was the deep-going changes in the crisis of the colonial system and, last but not least, the sharpening of the basic contradictions of imperialism.

The most distinctive feature of the third stage in the general crisis of capitalism is that it has no connection with a world war. Another special feature is that it began in an environment of struggle and competition between the two world socio-economic systems, with the balance of forces tilting more and more in favour of socialism and with the struggle of the peoples for democracy, national liberation and socialism becoming increasingly broader.

The economic and military strength of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, coupled with the mounting strength of the world's peace-loving forces, is preventing the imperialists from shunting the two systems from peaceful competition to a world-wide nuclear military conflict. This is a key feature of the crisis of imperialist policy.

Economically, the crisis of capitalism is betokened by the fact that the leading imperialist powers are continuously losing their former supremacy. The economies of the socialist countries are developing at a faster rate.

The economic instability of capitalism has mounted and so has the unevenness of development from country to country in the capitalist world. The United States, which is the leading and most powerful imperialist country, has become a kind of epicentre of economic upheavals and recessions. The US economy was hit by four crisis-type upheavals after the war—in 1949, 1953-54, 1957-58 and 1960-61. There were 5,437,000 unemployed during the 1957-58 crisis, and as many as 5,705,000 in February 1961.

The US economy has become one-sidedly militaristic.

Imperialism is exploiting technical progress for the arms race, and turning the achievements of the human genius against humanity.

Capitalism is thus enmeshed in insolvable contradictions. The arms race is fraught with grave dangers for the US economy, because it is undermining the foundations of extended reproduction. The US press noted in early 1962 that defence expenditures, despite their proportions, are unable to solve the main problem because they do not create riches that serve as a basis for further growth. Militarisation has brought about new disproportions and has struck heavily at the key economic branches. Cutbacks, entailing wholesale unemployment, have become a chronic affliction.

The disparities in rates of development are closing the gap between the economic levels of the United States and other industrial countries. The Federal Republic of Germany and Japan have made rapid headway. The two countries, plus Italy, already account for 17 per cent of the industrial output of the capitalist world, which is more than they accounted for in 1937. The pre-war contradictions between imperialist powers have revived and multiplied. The US monopolists, who lay claim to the leadership of the capitalist world, are running into mounting resistance on the part of their imperialist competitors.

Within the imperialist countries the general crisis of capitalism manifests itself in an acute sharpening of contradictions between the handful of monopolies and the rest of the people.

The facts hold up the lie to bourgeois talk about "class peace". This is illustrated, among other things, by the upswing of the strike movement in the capitalist countries:

	Number of strikers (millions)	Incl. strikers involved in political strikes (millions)
1958	25-27	11-12
1959	35-37	16-18
1960	54-58	41-45
1961	50-53	30-33
1962	56	35
1963	58	36

Today, the champions of imperialism are pinning their hopes on state-monopoly capitalism, which "combines the strength of the monopolies with that of the state in a single mechanism whose purpose is to enrich the monopolies, suppress the working-class movement and the national liberation struggle, save the capitalist system, and launch aggressive wars".¹ State intervention in economic affairs did indeed promote a growth of production and a renewal of basic assets. But state-monopoly capitalism cannot eliminate anarchy of production, crises and the other running sores of the moribund capitalist system. It is incapable of averting capitalism's inevitable collapse.

The US monopoly bourgeoisie is the bulwark of international reaction. US imperialism is playing the shameful role of world policeman. It is waging a dirty war in Vietnam, taking a hand in the bloodstained colonial moves in the Congo and holding down the patriotic forces of Latin America with a mailed fist. It does not bother to conceal its pathological hatred of the people, of freedom and democracy, and of socialism.

The policies of the imperialist states are based on dictatorship of monopoly capital. The monopolists employ a variety of methods to rob the people of the opportunity to voice their will and exercise their constitutional rights, curtailed though they are. They cut down, or abolish, the remnants of bourgeois democracy. In some Western countries the Communist Party has been banned and Communists are persecuted. The most reactionary section of the monopoly bourgeoisie is happy to support surviving fascist cliques and to establish authoritarian regimes. Fascist organisations have become more active in the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany and other Western countries.

But despite reactionary intrigues, despite the terrorism and the persecutions, the forces bent on winning socialism are continuing to grow. They are headed by the working class, which is aiming its main drive against the monopolies. The sound forces of every nation have a stake in ending the omnipotence of the monopolies. This is creating objectively favourable conditions for the unification of

¹ *The Road to Communism*, p. 471.

democratic movements in the fight against the financial oligarchies.

The world revolutionary movement has accumulated immense experience of struggle against imperialism. It has become more mature and better organised, and its militancy has never been greater.

The world capitalist system is rent by deep and acute contradictions—those between labour and capital, between the young national states and the old colonial powers, and between the imperialist powers themselves. But the main contradiction of our time is that between socialism and imperialism.

The moribund capitalist system will never be able to alter the inexorable march of history, not even with nuclear weapons. It is ripe for proletarian socialist revolutions, for we are living in the historic epoch of man's transition from capitalism to socialism.

Peaceful Coexistence of States with Different Social Systems

Their correct understanding of the contemporary epoch and the prospects of social development has enabled the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties to work out a number of key international problems, such as the possibility of averting wars, the forms of transition by various countries to socialism, peaceful coexistence, etc. The 20th, 21st, 22nd and 23rd congresses of the CPSU furnished exhaustive definitions of the principle of peaceful coexistence as applied to the current epoch.

Practice of the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence is doubly important in our time when mankind faces the choice between peaceful coexistence and nuclear war.

The policy of peaceful coexistence, aimed against the most reactionary and bellicose imperialist forces, builds on unconditional respect of the right of every nation to pick its own social and political system. The climate of peaceful coexistence furthers the liberation struggle and the realisation of the revolutionary tasks of the peoples. Peaceful coexistence is a special form of class struggle on the world scene.

Opponents of peaceful coexistence maintain that Lenin and the Soviet Communists conceived the coexistence of states of the two social systems as a chain of inevitable and unintermittent clashes, not short of armed clashes. Bourgeois ideologists say peaceful coexistence is equivalent to cold war. Such contentions are absolutely groundless. Clashes between the socialist and capitalist systems have indeed occurred, and still occur. There have been armed attacks and armed interventions against socialism. Lenin and the CPSU have always called on the Soviet people to be vigilant. Even under peaceful coexistence, the socialist countries must always be on their guard and always ready to repulse aggression. Yet Lenin pointed out that peaceful relations between socialist and capitalist countries were desirable, necessary and mutually advantageous. From the first, the Soviet state has striven to establish and maintain relations with the capitalist countries.

Those who identify the concept of cold war and peaceful coexistence could not be more wrong. Peaceful coexistence, as defined in the CC Report to the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, is based on a mutual rejection of war as a means of settling international disputes. Not only must countries with different social systems exist side by side; they must promote relations based on trust and co-operation.

Some may ask whether the principle of peaceful coexistence implies reconciliation between socialism and capitalism. They may ask whether it implies the recognition that the capitalist order is everlasting. They may ask, too, whether the struggle against imperialism is being relaxed.

The answer to all three questions is "no".

Peaceful coexistence ought to be regarded as one of the principal forms of struggle against imperialism and the wars it is hatching, against the arms drive, the aggressive designs of the monopolists in the colonial countries, etc. This struggle is being prosecuted in the interest of the working class, of all working people, and, in this sense, it is a class struggle. Socialism is certain to win the peaceful competition against capitalism, because the socialist mode of production has decisive advantages over the capitalist. There is no contradiction whatsoever between the Marxist-Leninist proposition about the inevitable triumph of com-

munism throughout the world and the policy of peaceful coexistence. Peaceful coexistence concerns relations between states and in no way concerns the revolutionary struggle of the working class for the reconstruction of society.

The contradiction between the socialist and capitalist systems is still the principal contradiction of our time. The struggle between socialism and capitalism will continue without letup in the political, economic and ideological fields.

The victory of communism is inevitable, but it will not be achieved by "export of revolution". Lenin pointed out that capitalist rule crumbles not because someone wishes to seize power. No power on earth could destroy capitalism if it were not undermined and sapped by history. Capitalism will be toppled by the peoples which it exploits. The theory of "export of revolution" is a bourgeois invention and has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism.

Imperialist politicians are eager to pervert the concept of peaceful coexistence. They want the principles of peaceful coexistence applied solely to relations between the Great Powers, particularly the USSR and the USA. But the Soviet Government has made it clear that nobody should think the USA may interfere in the domestic affairs of other countries, provoke armed conflicts and undertake acts of aggression against any socialist country, and yet talk of agreements with the Soviet Union concerning an "easing of tension".

The principles of peaceful coexistence do not signify any reconciliation between the communist and bourgeois ideologies. On the contrary, ideology is one of the main sectors of the class struggle in which socialism demonstrates its advantages over moribund capitalism. Concessions in matters of ideology, the CPSU has stressed time and again, are entirely out of the question. Peaceful coexistence does not imply a relaxation of the struggle of the working class and the Communist Parties for the triumph of socialist ideas. Quite the reverse. What it implies is that ideological and political disputes should not be settled by war.

The Soviet Union wants political, economic and other relations between the socialist and capitalist countries to

develop on the basis of the peaceful coexistence principle and the rejection of war as a means of settling controversies. Peaceful coexistence requires a sensible and realistic approach to inter-state relations. The Communists have their own views, and the governing groups in the imperialist countries have theirs. The Communists consider social development as an ascendant objective law-governed historical process stemming from the existing relation of class forces in a country. The Communists believe the victory of socialism and communism the world over is inevitable. They are deeply convinced that they are right. And they are bent on arguing their case and disseminating their views. But it is one thing to argue one's case and to prove one's point by the example of the socialist countries and the development of human society, and another thing to impose one's views, to implant this or that ideology by force of arms. The Communists are quite sure that no ideology, the communist included, can be implanted coercively, by means of war.

Peaceful coexistence does not inhibit the forces of the communist and national liberation movements. On the contrary, it rallies broad sections of the people to the Communists. The successes of the socialist countries inspire the working people in their revolutionary struggle and attract new followers. Peaceful coexistence paralyses the most bellicose section of imperialists, hampers export of counter-revolution, obstructs action against the national liberation movement, etc.

The facts show that peaceful coexistence does not act as a brake on the revolutionary process. Quite the contrary. The new stage of the general crisis of capitalism began at a time of peace, and the victory of the socialist revolution in Cuba and the overthrow of imperialist rule and establishment of democratic power in many countries occurred in the absence of war.

The Soviet Government and the CPSU know perfectly well that the policy of peaceful coexistence will keep running into the resistance of warmongers.

The Soviet Union goes out of its way to co-ordinate the efforts of all states in the interest of international security and the consolidation of world peace. It calls unceasingly for effective steps to eliminate the danger of a new world

war. The peaceful aspirations of the USSR are known all over the world. But the Soviet Union is ready at any moment to repulse the forces of imperialist aggression.

The problem of peaceful coexistence is bound up closely with the question of the possibility of preventing wars.

Possibility of Preventing Wars in Our Time

The Marxist-Leninist proposition that wars are inevitable under imperialism was formulated at a time when capitalism was an all-embracing system and the social and political forces opposing war were still weak and divided.

Historians estimate that in the 3,640 years of recorded history peace reigned on earth for a total of less than 300 years. Social systems based on the exploitation of man by man gave rise to a countless number of wars, which, as the weapons of war developed, became more and more destructive. The two world wars, which claimed tens of millions of lives and caused appalling destruction in vast areas, were the most terrible of all. And a new world war is likely to claim hundreds of millions of lives. The explosive power of just one of the bigger nuclear bombs surpasses that of all the weapons employed in all the preceding wars.

Is peace possible in our time? Is world war still fatally inevitable? Will mankind be plagued by world wars so long as imperialism survives?

The answers to these questions are of the utmost importance to all nations, and to every individual. The 20th-23rd congresses of the CPSU and the 1957 and 1960 Meetings of Communist and Workers' Parties furnished hopeful replies.

So long as imperialism reigns in a part of the world, the ground for aggressive wars remains. The predatory nature of imperialism has not changed. As we know, the more rabidly adventuresome elements among the politicians, statesmen and generals of the imperialist powers consider new aggressive wars the only means of saving imperialism. But the world situation, and the relation of forces in the world, have changed radically.

In the past, imperialist wars of conquest ended in a redistribution of forces within the capitalist system. The

victors sought to keep their plunder, and the losers prepared for a new redivision of the world. Germany, for example, which lost the First World War, rapidly restored her strength and started a second world war. But times have changed. Their dread of retaliation is making the imperialist politicians more cautious. The architects of imperialist policy know that by starting a war they would invoke the destruction of their entire social system.

And, which is more important, there are strong public and political forces today that champion peace. Take the socialist community, which has the necessary material resources to prevent a new world war and to strike back devastatingly if the imperialists attempt to start one.

For the first time, a state peaceful by nature appeared in the world in 1917. Soviet foreign policy has always restrained the aggressive behaviour of the imperialists. Today, the immense Soviet military and economic potential stands guard over peace.

In championing peace, the Soviet people are serving much more than just their own interest. The destiny of all peoples is dear to them. They delivered mankind from fascist bondage, and stand in the van with the peoples of the fraternal countries against the new claimants to world domination. Soviet nuclear striking power is quite sufficient to repulse those who might try to infringe on the gains of the socialist countries.

Many of the newly free countries, too, are working for peace, because they want to eliminate the aftermaths of colonialism as quickly as they can, build up their own economy, a modern industry and mechanised agriculture. So the foreign policy of the neutralist, or non-aligned, states is another roadblock to aggressive imperialist designs.

The working-class movement in the capitalist countries is one more potent political force working for peace. During the Second World War the working class initiated nation-wide resistance to fascism. After the war, it took the lead in the movement for peace and democracy, rallying broad sections of peasants, intellectuals and the middle strata in the towns to their side. The working class and its vanguard, the Communist and Workers' Parties, are marshalling all people irrespective of their political beliefs, social background and racial, religious and other differ-

ences, to safeguarding the peace. A united front of millions of people of goodwill has been forged in the mass campaigns against the threat of a new world war.

The peace movement, which came into being after the war, is a powerful anti-war force. Good organisation, mass proportions and efficiency are its distinctive traits. The movement has travelled a long and arduous road since its inauguration. It has had successes in the pitched battles for peace, and it has had failures. But, certainly, it has accomplished a great deal.

Those, shortly, are the forces blocking aggression.

Taking note of the radical changes that have occurred in the world and of the growth of the peace-loving forces, the CPSU at its 20th Congress arrived at the highly salient conclusion that world wars are not fatally inevitable in our time. The 21st Congress of the CPSU, too, stressed with regard to the influence exercised on the international situation by the staggering economic plans of the USSR and the other socialist countries that "even before the complete victory of socialism on earth, with capitalism extant in a part of the world, a real possibility will appear to exclude world war from the life of society".

The 22nd Congress made yet another step forward in developing the proposition about the possibility of preventing wars in our time. It pointed out that there are bright prospects of attaining peaceful coexistence throughout the period in which the social and political problems dividing mankind are to be solved.

The 1960 Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties underscored that the time had come when aggressive imperialist attempts to start a world war could be frustrated.

USSR Combats Imperialism and Works for Peace and International Co-operation

There are two basic trends in post-war international relations. One is the imperialist trend, designed to intensify world tension, excite war hysteria, and bend weaker countries to its will by threats and provocations, and by economic and political pressure. This trend has been christened

the policy "from positions of strength". It is pursued by the USA and its imperialist allies. They whipped up an array of politico-military blocs, such as NATO, SEATO and CENTO. The makers of the policy "from strength" go out of their way to keep the world "on the brink of war" and, on this pretext, to sustain an intensive arms drive.

The other trend is epitomised by the peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, which want nothing better than peace, an easing of international tensions, and neighbourly and mutually advantageous relations among all countries of the world.

It should always be remembered that, as Lenin put it, "we are exerting our main influence on the international revolution through our economic policy". As early as 1921, Lenin stressed that "the struggle in this field has now become global. Once we solve this problem, we shall have certainly and finally won on an international scale."¹

Nothing will finalise and develop the successes of the revolution and prove the advantages of socialism over capitalism as conclusively as labour, the labour of the people. True, this is not easy when the revolution occurs in countries with a poorly developed economy. But the example of some of the socialist countries has proved that imposing successes may be achieved in economic development, provided the right Leninist course is followed.

The history of the world communist movement bears out the fact that a political party fails in its mission if, though it calls itself a workers' or labour party, it divorces the political struggle from the struggle for improving the material condition of the working class, the peasants and all working men. Those who endeavour to restrict the class struggle to purely economic matters are also bound to slide into reformism. A party will never be a truly revolutionary and Marxist-Leninist party, and will never secure the victory of the socialist revolution, unless it employs all the forms of class struggle and combines them skilfully.

A socio-political system, whatever it may be, or a form of government, are the result of processes governed by the complex objective laws of social development. The international situation, on the other hand, depends on the nature

¹ Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 437.

of relations between states, regulated largely by diplomatic means. The Soviet Union is able to carry through its Leninist policy of peace and friendship effectively thanks to its Marxist-Leninist appreciation of the state and trend of current international affairs with all their contradictions, to its uncompromising attitude towards hostile ideology, and to its diplomatic skill.

In 1945, the Soviet Union had diplomatic relations with 52 countries. Today, it has diplomatic relations with 95. The economic ties of the USSR, a highly pertinent factor improving the international situation, are expanding steadily. From 1958 to 1964 Soviet trade with the socialist countries increased from 5,700 million to 9,700 million rubles, and from 2,000 million to 4,000 million with the other countries of the world. From 1953 to 1964 commerce with the developing countries seeking economic independence mounted twelve times over. All in all, more than 100 countries have enduring trade relations with the Soviet Union.

The USSR is continuously expanding its cultural and scientific contacts with other countries.

In 1964, Soviet government institutions had cultural and scientific contacts with 106 countries. More than 17,000 scientists, cultural workers, sportsmen, etc., went abroad that year under bilateral agreements alone, while some 19,000 foreign scientists and cultural workers visited the Soviet Union. Soviet specialists are working abroad at various scientific, educational, medical, sports and other establishments in over 30 countries. Soviet cultural and science workers attended more than 500 international congresses, conferences, and the like, in 1964. Tourism, too, has been on the upgrade.

Visits of Party and Government delegations and other official trips abroad also help to extend the Soviet Union's international contacts, and to promote peace.

Between 1956 and 1964 parliamentary groups from dozens of countries, including Asian, African and Latin American states, visited the Soviet Union. Delegations of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR also visited many countries.

Improvement of the foreign policy machinery and the daily guidance afforded by the CPSU have ensured the successful employment by Soviet diplomacy of a variety of

new methods. One of them is effective warning against possible aggressions. Whenever the imperialists begin a manoeuvre leading up to an aggression against newly independent nations, the Soviet Government issues a firm warning that the entire might of the USSR, including the latest weapons, will be invoked to defend the just cause of the freedom-loving peoples. This was done in 1956 when Britain, France and Israel attacked Egypt, in 1957 during the high tension in the Middle East caused by Anglo-American provocations, and in 1961-62 during the US imperialist preparations for an invasion of Cuba.

Yet the method of effective warning has nothing in common with the threats and intimidations of bourgeois diplomacy.

For one thing, the firm Soviet demarches come as a last resort, after all other means of settling the controversy prove futile.

The method of effective warning could not be employed until the Soviet Union acquired a powerful economic and military potential. It was developed recently and is based on the might of the socialist community.

The emergence of the world socialist system also produced the method of collective action by the fraternal countries.

The forms of their diplomatic co-operation vary. They range from the framing of a single policy on the basis of Leninist principles in relation to the key problems of international life, to joint statements and exchanges of opinion, mutual support at international conferences and organisations, and agreed diplomatic demarches.

In view of the identity of interests in the struggle for peace, against imperialism, Soviet diplomacy co-operates with the independent Asian and African countries on many key international issues. It takes the wishes of these states into account in its proposals and statements.

Soviet diplomacy acts effectively in support of the international prestige of the neutralist states. For example, the USSR is striving for India to be recognised as a Great Power and for the General Secretariat and other UN bodies to be reorganised in a manner consistent with the interests of the neutralist states. The USSR is insisting that

their representatives be invited to participate in the work of international conferences.

While labouring for the peaceful solution of controversial problems, the Communist Party and the Government of the USSR show constant concern for the strengthening of the Soviet Armed Forces, so that the Soviet Union should be capable of bridling any and all aggressors at any time.

The Soviet people are tirelessly increasing the potential of their country and working for the unity of all revolutionary, democratic and peace-loving forces in the struggle against imperialism and war.

CHAPTER II

THE SOVIET UNION WORKS FOR UNITY, FRIENDSHIP AND CO-OPERATION OF SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

New Type of International Relations

The socialist world economic system crystallised by the early 1950s. It took only a few dozen years for socialism to become a world system, where the capitalist system took several centuries. We owe it to the distinct advantages of socialism over capitalism that the formation of the community of socialist states occurred so quickly.

The two systems, as we know, were wrought by the operation of objective economic factors. As the productive forces developed, they outgrew the national framework of the various countries, and it became impossible for states to exist in isolation. Countries became associated through a definite system of political, economic and cultural relations. How quickly such varied relations appeared, and how enduring they were, depended on the methods and means employed in establishing them. Experience shows that the ways and means of forming world systems of states depend on the nature and substance of the classes in charge of the process.

The formation of the world capitalist system was a process in which the strong put down the weak. The peoples still remember the countless colonial wars waged by the European bourgeoisie to "attach" overseas territories. Take the so-called opium wars fought by the British bourgeoisie in concert with capitalists of other countries against the people of China in the 19th century. They "attached" China to the world capitalist system and reduced that country to the status of a semi-colony, which lasted for over 100 years.

The bourgeoisie built up the world capitalist economy with fire and sword. Armed conquest and various forms of coercion were its chief means. The regime of capitulation, the "open door" policy, concessions and spheres of influence personify capitalist-type international relations. The regime of capitulation in Turkey, Iran and China granted special privileges to the capitalist powers. Foreigners were not liable to trial in local courts. Foreign citizens and firms enjoyed commercial and tax privileges, and the like. Some of these privileges, acquired in the 18th and 19th centuries, still operate in a veiled form in some Asian, African and Latin American countries.

The principles of equality and sovereignty proclaimed by some of the bourgeois revolutions were purely formal. To this day, many of the Western countries are almost entirely dependent on the leading imperialist powers. Interference in the domestic affairs of the weaker countries is taken for granted within the world capitalist system.

Let us now see how the socialist system took shape.

The First International headed by Marx and Engels called on the working-class movement to "vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations".¹

The socialist system, a product of the world revolutionary movement, is living up to these great tenets of the founders of scientific communism.

The world socialist system is a social, economic and political community of free and sovereign peoples that follow the socialist and communist path, fused by common interests and goals, and by the close bonds of international proletarian solidarity.

The communion of the socialist states is entirely voluntary, and is implicit in the very nature of socialism. A new, heretofore unknown type of international relations appeared. It is highlighted by genuine equality, mutual respect of independence and sovereignty, and by fraternal mutual assistance and co-operation.

These features are organic components of the relations between socialist countries, because the latter have a

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Vol. I, p. 385.

common economic basis, the same political system and an identical ideology.

The world socialist system has already passed through a few stages. In the first stage, the USSR and the People's Democracies of Europe and Asia sought political communion primarily to consolidate and safeguard the gains of the revolution from a possible imperialist aggression. Their relations were based on bilateral mutual aid agreements. The first such agreement was concluded between the Soviet Union and the Mongolian People's Republic back in 1936. Then followed friendship, co-operation and mutual assistance treaties between the USSR and Czechoslovakia (December 12, 1943), Poland (April 21, 1945), Rumania (February 4, 1948), Hungary (February 18, 1948), Bulgaria (March 18, 1948), the People's Republic of China (February 14, 1950), the German Democratic Republic (September 20, 1955) and the Korean People's Democratic Republic (July 6, 1961). Similar treaties were concluded between Poland and Czechoslovakia (March 10, 1947), Albania and Bulgaria (December 16, 1947), Rumania and Hungary (January 24, 1948), etc.

These treaties went a long way in frustrating the numerous imperialist attempts to resurrect the capitalist system in the People's Democracies. They also helped to adjust certain political, territorial and economic problems inherited from the former regimes.

Treaties between fraternal countries help pool their efforts in the building of socialism and communism, and in safeguarding their revolutionary gains from imperialist encroachments.

As time went on, a variety of forms of *multilateral* political, economic, cultural and diplomatic co-operation sprang up between the socialist states.

The establishment of such collective bodies as the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) and the defensive Warsaw Treaty Organisation was an important milestone in the development of the world socialist system.

The founding of CMEA in 1949 gave a start to multilateral economic collaboration between the socialist countries. At first, CMEA consisted of the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Rumania and Czechoslovakia. Later it was joined by Albania, the German Democratic Republic

and the Mongolian People's Republic. The People's Republic of China, the Korean People's Democratic Republic and Cuba (since 1964) are represented in CMEA by observers. The Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia, too, participates in some of the CMEA organisations. CMEA follows the principles of the complete equality of all its member-countries and of respect for their sovereign interests. The main purpose of the Council is to organise exchanges of experience in economic development, promote mutual scientific and technical aid, facilitate proper supply of raw materials, fuel, machines and equipment, and co-ordinate economic planning and the development of key industries with the object of a rational division of labour.

The Warsaw Treaty Organisation was founded in 1955 by the USSR, Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Rumania and Czechoslovakia. The pact was necessitated by the considerably increased threat of war after the Western powers concluded their Paris Agreements for the remilitarisation of the Bonn Republic (October 1954) and the FRG was admitted to NATO. A new situation took shape in Europe, compelling the socialist countries to extend their common efforts in order to reinforce their security.

Observers from other socialist countries have been participating in the conferences of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation from the day it was founded. Questions of security are handled by a Political Consultative Committee, and a Joint Command heads the armed forces made available to the Warsaw Treaty Organisation by its members.

The socialist states collaborate closely in the struggle against imperialism and colonialism, for world peace. The common principles and goals of their foreign policy pave the way to unity in their diplomatic activity.

Relations Between the USSR and Other Socialist Countries in the Early Half of the Fifties

The evolution of the new type of international relations entailed certain difficulties, chiefly due to a lack of experience. There were also mistakes of a subjective nature.

This had a deplorable effect on the relations of the Soviet Union with the fraternal countries. When mixed companies were conceived, for example, it was found eventually, for all the benefits they yielded to the economies of Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary and China, that this form of economic contact did not accord with the spirit and character of relations between socialist countries.

Relations with Yugoslavia caused particular concern. It will be recalled that Soviet-Yugoslav friendship goes back to the remote past. During the Second World War it was sealed in the struggle against the common enemy. Yet in 1948 and 1949 relations between Yugoslavia and the other socialist countries deteriorated sharply.

At first, the differences between them were ideological. They concerned important aspects of revolutionary theory and practice. Instead of seeking patiently for an adjustment of these differences, a break was precipitated in the fraternal relations between the socialist countries and Yugoslavia.

In 1953-56, the CC CPSU and the Soviet Government undertook a series of important steps to remove the backwash. Soviet-Yugoslav relations were normalised on the initiative of the USSR.

Government delegations of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia negotiated to this end in Belgrade from May 27 to June 2, 1955. The declaration adopted by the delegations envisaged a sweeping normalisation of relations and outlined the pertinent measures. The documents published in connection with the negotiations stressed that despite persistent efforts of foreign capital to invade the Yugoslav economy, the Republic had retained her national independence and sovereignty. The joint communique noted that public property was dominant in Yugoslavia's big and middle industries, the transport system, banking, wholesale and most of retail trade. The working class and working peasantry, the communique said, stood at the helm of the country.

All the fraternal parties backed the initiative of the CC CPSU aimed at restoring friendly relations with Yugoslavia. The Soviet decision (in 1954) to turn over to Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary and China Soviet-owned shares in mixed companies was also met with approval. The Soviet Govern-

ment set to eliminating other abnormalities that impeded the further development of fraternal relations.

All this helped to strengthen relations and co-operation between the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. In 1956, the Soviet Union assisted the European socialist countries in building 391 industrial projects and more than 90 individual factory shops and installations. An iron and steel works, Nova Huta, was constructed in Poland. Similar iron and steel giants were also built in Czechoslovakia and Hungary. Textile, chemical and tractor works were built in Bulgaria, Rumania and Albania.

The Soviet Union rendered versatile support to the German Democratic Republic, which today ranks among the top ten economically most developed countries of the world.¹

The Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries helped the People's Republic of China to accomplish her economic rehabilitation plan (for 1950-52) and her subsequent five-year plans. Of the 694 industrial projects on which the main effort of the Chinese people was concentrated in the first five-year plan (1953-57), 156 projects were built with Soviet assistance. By the end of 1954, as many as 19 enterprises had already begun operating.

At the close of the third year of the first five-year plan period (1955), the Chinese people were already making own lathes, locomotives, airplanes, coal-cutting combines and automobiles. Western experts had said it would take at least 20 years to restore the Anshan Iron and Steel Works. But thanks to the heroic labour of China's working class and to Soviet assistance, the restored and reconstructed works yielded more metal in 1953-55 than in all the years of Japan's imperialist rule over North-East China.

Similar assistance was extended by the Soviet Union and other fraternal countries to the Mongolian People's Republic, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Korean People's Democratic Republic. The non-returnable 1,000 million rubles granted by the Soviet Government in 1953 helped greatly to restore the economy of the Korean

¹ See Chapter VI for more detail on the fraternal friendship of the USSR and GDR, their joint struggle against West German militarism and revanchism, for the consolidation of European peace.

People's Democratic Republic, which had suffered painfully from the war the imperialists had unleashed in Korea in 1950. The living standard of the Korean people improved perceptibly.

Multilateral forms of co-operation gradually gained in importance in the early fifties. This spurred the development of socialist countries at rates unheard-of under capitalism. In 1956, the Soviet Union ranked second in the world for total industrial output. The pre-war industrial output of Poland was surpassed four times over, that of Bulgaria five times over, Czechoslovakia's more than twice over, Hungary's by 250 per cent, Rumania's by nearly 200 per cent, Albania's more than 11 times over, the German Democratic Republic's by more than 100 per cent and Yugoslavia's by nearly 200 per cent. The pre-war industrial output of the People's Republic of China, too, was surpassed by more than 100 per cent.

By 1956, the socialist system accounted for some 30 per cent of the world industrial output. The socialist countries yielded more than one-third of the coal, one-quarter of the steel and about one-sixth of the electric power output of the world.

The political relations of the socialist countries, based on fraternal mutual assistance in the defence of revolutionary gains, made good headway.

After the Korean war ended, and then also the war in Indochina, the governments of the USSR and the People's Republic of China reached an agreement in October 1954 on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Port Arthur by May 31, 1955. All installations in the area were turned over gratis to the Chinese People's Republic.

The terms of the agreement were fulfilled within the specified time. The warmth with which the Chinese working people saw off the Soviet troops stationed in the Port Arthur district since August 1945 spoke of the sympathy and affection they had for their faithful friend, the Soviet Union. At public meetings, Chinese speakers thanked the Soviet soldiers and officers for liberating the country's north-east from the Japanese colonialists. The Chinese nation, they said, would never forget that the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union played an outstanding part in crushing the Japanese militarists and creating favourable

conditions for the victory of the Chinese people's revolution. A monument was erected in Port Arthur in September 1955 in tribute to Soviet soldiers. At the unveiling ceremony, General Hsiao-Ke, Deputy Defence Minister of the CPR, said the "Soviet soldiers and officers who gave their lives for a righteous cause won everlasting glory and deep respect among the Chinese people".

Impact of the 20th Congress of the CPSU

The 20th Congress of the CPSU (February 1956) devoted much attention to matters related to the world socialist community. Its decisions had an immense bearing on the further development of the socialist system. The Congress stressed that the extension of fraternal relations with other socialist countries was one of the Soviet Communist Party's cardinal political tasks. The more cohesive and the stronger the socialist countries are, it said, the more dependable the peace.

The 20th Congress of the CPSU described the steady expansion of economic ties between the socialist countries as a fact of great international significance. "Close economic co-operation," said the Report of the CC CPSU to the Congress, "provides exceptional opportunities for the best possible utilisation of productive and raw material resources and successfully combines the interests of each country with those of the socialist camp as a whole."¹

The Congress analysed the various forms of economic co-operation prevailing between the socialist countries and laid stress on such new forms as co-ordination of economic plans, specialisation and co-operation in production.

The Congress condemned the errors that occurred in the Stalin cult period in the relations between the socialist states. It called for strict adherence to the Leninist principle of the equality of nations and urged greater consideration for the history and special features of every country embarking on reconstruction.

The world communist movement hailed CPSU efforts to live down the personality cult, which is foreign to Marxism-

¹ Report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the 20th Party Congress, Moscow, 1956, p. 11.

Leninism. In all countries Communists emphasised the immense international impact of the measures taken by the CPSU to restore the Leninist principles of Party and government activity and to promote socialist democracy.

The political report of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party to its 8th Congress (September 1956), for example, said on this score:

"The 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, held in February, is a most important political event of world-wide significance."

It went on to stress approvingly that the 20th Congress of the CPSU "condemned the personality cult, which had caused far-reaching consequences within the Party".

"It goes to the credit of the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union," said a pertinent statement of the Political Bureau of the French Communist Party, "that they undertook to rectify the errors and deficiencies stemming from the personality cult. This speaks of the strength and unity of Lenin's great Party, of the trust it enjoys among the Soviet people, and of its prestige in the world working-class movement."

The 20th Congress endorsed the policy of the CPSU to promote greater cohesion among the socialist countries, reinforce the unity of the fraternal parties and rally all anti-imperialist forces. This policy caused a fresh howl among the imperialists. They tried to make the most of the criticism of Stalin's personality cult to step up attacks on the Soviet Union and the other socialist states. Imperialist propaganda sought to persuade the masses that the personality cult stemmed from the nature of socialism.

The imperialists were elated by the activation of revisionist elements in some of the Communist and Workers' Parties. They strove to capitalise on it by sowing strife and poisoning relations between socialist states with the venom of mutual suspicion.

The imperialists banked on the so-called "national communism", which was quite favourably described by the late John Foster Dulles, then the US Secretary of State. This type of "communism" provides for the "building of socialism" in a given country without the support and co-operation of other socialist countries; repudiates the principal propositions of Marxist-Leninist theory; rejects the expe-

rience of other countries; kindles nationalist survivals, and the like. The true sense of these political prescriptions boils down to an ultimate restoration of capitalism in the process of ostensibly socialist "construction".

The imperialist reactionaries counted on this when they tried to pull Poland and Hungary out of the socialist camp in 1956. On June 28, 1956, counter-revolutionary elements incited street clashes in the Polish town of Poznan. They made the most of the economic difficulties and errors stemming from violations of revolutionary legality in the country. People's power quickly took control and restored order.

But the subversive elements would not admit defeat. They stepped up their anti-popular activities in other towns and areas. Imperialist agents were smuggled into the country in greater numbers. US Congress added another \$25 million to the usual annual \$100 million allocated under the so-called Mutual Security Act for espionage and subversion in the socialist countries. The US press confessed that the money was intended for "financing actions like those that brought about the disorders in Poznan".

At the tensest moment of the Polish people's struggle against hostile forces, the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party convened its 8th Plenary Meeting (October 19-21, 1956). The Plenary Meeting laid bare the grave errors of the old Party and Government leadership and outlined ways and means of rectifying them. Comrade Wladyslaw Gomulka was chosen to head the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party. Speaking of the futility of all attempts to pull Poland out of its fraternal alliance with the Soviet Union, Gomulka said:

"If anybody thinks anti-Soviet sentiment can be fanned in Poland, he is deeply mistaken. We shall not allow anybody to injure the vital interests of the Polish state and the cause of socialist construction in Poland."

Fraternal Assistance to the Hungarian People

The attention of the world was drawn to Hungary at the end of 1956, when internal counter-revolutionary forces there, and world imperialist reaction, instigated an uprising aimed at abolishing the socialist gains of Hungary's working people.

The previous leadership of the Hungarian Working People's Party had committed grave errors in general political matters, as well as in economic and cultural reconstruction.

"The mistakes caused by the personality cult and dogmatism," wrote Janos Kadar, "infringed on the democracy of proletarian dictatorship, undermined trust in the Party and caused breakdowns in socialist construction. This is the reason why domestic and international reactionaries were able in 1956 to start a counter-revolutionary uprising in our country."¹

The putsch was prepared by a nationalist revisionist bloc, backed by international imperialism.

The instigators of the mutiny intended to destroy the government of workers and peasants and restore the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and landowners. Hand in hand with the surviving fascist scum, the revisionists and nationalists launched a rabid anti-Soviet campaign in order to split the socialist camp, hot up the tension in Europe and distract attention from the imperialist aggression launched at the time by Britain, France and Israel against Egypt.

The imperialists of the United States and other Western powers gave generous aid to the Hungarian counter-revolution. On October 25, 1956, President Dwight Eisenhower issued a statement obviously designed to encourage the insurrection. Radio station Free Europe stepped up its provocative activities. Numerous pamphlets, which urged Hungarians to take action against the People's Democracy, were printed in the West and shipped into Hungary.

For several days a reign of terror swept the country. The mutineers ran amok in the streets of Budapest and other cities, smashing the premises of public organisations, torturing and killing Hungarian patriots and exterminating Communists faithful to the socialist cause. The peril of extremist reactionaries seizing power in the country loomed big indeed.

But the designs of international reaction, inspired by the US imperialists, fell through. On November 4, 1956, a provisional revolutionary workers' and peasants' government was established in Hungary. It appealed to the Soviet

¹ *Pravda*, April 1, 1965.

troops stationed in the country under the terms of the Warsaw Treaty to help the Hungarian people squash the counter-revolution. Faithful to its internationalist duty, the Soviet Union came promptly to the assistance of the fraternal Hungarian nation. The insurrectionists were routed.

"All politically conscious and honest Hungarians," said Janos Kadar, head of the Hungarian Government, "will gratefully remember the assistance rendered by the Soviet Union to the Hungarian people in 1956 at the request of the Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government when a counter-revolution broke out and the danger of an imperialist intervention loomed big. Thanks to this assistance we succeeded in frustrating the imperialist attempt to saddle the Hungarian people with capitalism and fascism and to turn our land into a military staging area, an arena of battle."¹

The counter-revolutionary putsch made havoc of the Hungarian economy. Commodities worth 1,500 million forints were destroyed. The damage to public buildings and dwellings added up to 1,000 million forints. Due to the curtailment or temporary stoppage of production the 1956 national income shrank by 9,000 million forints.

In view of the grave situation, the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic appealed to the fraternal countries for material help. The Soviet Union granted 250 million rubles in long-term credits. The People's Republic of China made 30 million rubles available in cash and material. Oil products, building materials, medical supplies and other goods worth 13 million lei came from Rumania. Bulgaria sent the Hungarian people sugar, rice, beans, building materials, coal, oil, and the like. Mongolia shipped in 2,000 tons of wheat, 100 tons of beef and 15 tons of sausage. The German Democratic Republic granted commodities worth 22 million marks, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam 3 million rubles, Czechoslovakia 90 million crowns, and Poland 100 million zloty.

The fraternal solidarity shown by the socialist countries at the time of the Hungarian events was a fresh token of proletarian internationalism.

¹ VII sjezd vengerskoi sotsialisticheskoi rabochei partii, Gospolitizdat, 1960, p. 7.

Negotiations Between Socialist Countries in 1956-57

The Soviet Government Declaration of October 30, 1956, had a strong bearing on the further development of relations between socialist countries. The Declaration stressed that the Soviet Union was firmly determined to keep up the policy of the 20th Congress of the CPSU as regards stringent adherence to Leninist principles in its relations with the socialist states.

The Soviet Union voiced its readiness to discuss with the governments of other socialist countries all measures reinforcing economic and other fraternal ties. It was necessary, the Declaration said, to rule out all violations of the principle of respect for national sovereignty and equal co-operation.

The Declaration also referred to the promotion of co-operation among the socialist states in matters of defence. It stressed that such military co-operation was based on the 1955 Warsaw Treaty.

The entire socialist camp received the Soviet Government's appraisal of the state and prospects of relations between the members of the big socialist family with deep satisfaction. "The emergence of the new system and the deep-going revolutionary reconstruction of social relations," the Declaration said, "involved no few difficulties, unsolved problems and outright mistakes, including such as were committed in the sphere of mutual relations between socialist countries."¹

Yet the new type of international relations showed immense vitality. The fraternal countries rectified existing errors and cleared the path for a deeper and more versatile utilisation of the advantages offered by the socialist community. Important negotiations took place on the strength of the Soviet Declaration in 1956 and 1957 between the USSR and the Polish People's Republic (November 15-18, 1956), the Rumanian People's Republic (November 26-December 3, 1956), the German Democratic Republic (January 3-8, 1957), the People's Republic of China (January 7-19, 1957), the Czechoslovak Republic (January 25-29, 1957), the People's Republic of Bulgaria (February 15-21,

¹ Pravda, Oct. 31, 1956.

1957), the Hungarian People's Republic (March 20-28, 1957), the People's Republic of Albania (April 11-17, 1957), and the Mongolian People's Republic (May 10-15, 1957).

All pressing issues were discussed in a comradely spirit, and measures were worked out to eliminate the remaining consequences of the personality cult in the relations between socialist countries.

Lenin taught that "only exclusive attention to the interests of various nations can remove grounds for conflicts, can remove mutual mistrust, can remove the fear of any intrigues and create that confidence, especially on the part of the workers and peasants speaking different languages, without which there absolutely cannot be peaceful relations between peoples or anything like a successful development of everything that is of value in present-day civilization".¹

This important Marxist-Leninist proposition was revived in full by the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Soviet Government. Each of the socialist countries took a most active part in solving the political, military, economic and other problems concerning the community as a whole.

Special emphasis in the negotiations was laid on peace and international security. A joint statement by the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic drew attention to the peril of a militarist revival in West Germany. The statement also referred to security in the Middle East and the Balkan Peninsula.

The measures taken by the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China to reinforce international security in the Far East were backed wholeheartedly by the other fraternal countries. The Soviet-Chinese Declaration of January 18, 1957, stressed that both countries were eager to establish peaceful coexistence with Japan and other capitalist countries. It welcomed the resumption of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Japan in the autumn of 1956 and expressed the wish to see Sino-Japanese relations normalised forthwith. "Japan's friendship and co-operation with the Soviet Union and China," the Declaration said, "is consistent with the interests not only

¹ Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 386.

of the USSR and CPR, but also with the vital interests of the Japanese people."¹

The joint statements which crowned the negotiations stressed over and over again that for the sake of peace it was essential to restore the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

The Soviet Government considers it absolutely intolerable that the great Chinese people is not represented to this day in the organisation designed to reflect the true image of the modern world. The only reason for this abnormal situation is the reluctance of the United States and other Western powers. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries continue to work assiduously for the restoration of China's lawful rights. At the annual debates of this issue at the UN General Assembly their spokesmen dismiss the fatuous arguments and unfair dodges employed by the US diplomats and their menials.

The socialist countries worked out a joint political line on international problems. They agreed their attitude towards the aggression of Britain, France and Israel against Egypt, towards the German question, and the like.

As a result of the Party and Government negotiations by the Soviet Union with other socialist countries in 1956 and 1957, the unity of the socialist community grew distinctly stronger. This, in turn, had a beneficial effect on the economic and cultural development of the countries concerned, and on their struggle against imperialist reaction. The imperialists' guileful intention of taking advantage of chauvinism, nationalist sentiment and some survivals of national dislike to undermine and disrupt the unity of the socialist countries, proved abortive.

The basic interests of the various fraternal countries and the world socialist system coincided entirely. The mistakes and deficiencies that occurred in the past were rectified after the 20th Congress of the CPSU, and were unable to eclipse the fundamental elements of fraternal mutual assistance and co-operation. This was the main conclusion drawn by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in the negotiations of 1956 and 1957, and the rapid and powerful upsurge of the socialist community bore it out.

¹ *Pod znamenem proletarskogo internatsionalizma*, Gospolitizdat, 1957, p. 286.

**1957 Moscow Meeting
on the Further Strengthening
of the Unity of Socialist Countries**

The Declaration of the Meeting of 12 Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries, held in Moscow November 14-16, 1957, is one of the most important contemporaneous programme documents of the world communist movement.

The Meeting stressed that the decisions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU had ushered in a new stage in the world communist movement. It noted the strong historic import of the 20th Congress propositions about the possibility of averting wars in our time, the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, etc.

The meeting gave flesh and bone to the thesis that the socialist community is vitally interested in world peace. "The Communist Parties," the Declaration said, "consider the struggle for peace as their foremost task. Together with all the peace-loving forces, they will do their best to prevent war."

In 1957, all the Communist Parties reiterated the cardinal importance of the struggle for peace, against imperialism. This idea was also dominant in the Peace Manifesto adopted by the parties concerned together with the Declaration. The 64 Communist and Workers' Parties that signed the Manifesto included all the Communist Parties of the socialist countries. "From now on," the Manifesto stressed, "let the countries with different social systems compete with one another in developing science and technology for peace. Let them demonstrate their superiority not on the field of battles, but in competition for progress and for raising living standards."

The Meeting branded the provocative inventions of the foes of communism about "export of revolution".

Summing up the rich experience of revolutionary reconstruction in European and Asian countries, the Declaration emphasised:

- socialism cannot be implanted from without;
- socialism is the outcome of the struggle of the working class and other progressives within each country;

none but the most bitter enemies of revolution are capable of saying that Communists want to impose their system on other peoples by force.

The reassertion by the Communist and Workers' Parties that their views were identical on the basic issues of socialist revolution and socialist construction was the most important result of the 1957 Moscow Meeting. The Declaration noted that despite the great variety of ways of reconstructing society along socialist lines, they had the following common principal features:

- leadership of the masses by the working class, of which the Marxist-Leninist party is the vanguard, in conducting proletarian revolution in one form or another and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat in one form or another;

- alliance of the working class with the peasants and other working people;

- abolition of capitalist ownership and establishment of public ownership of the chief means of production;

- gradual socialist reconstruction of agriculture;
- planned development of the economy, centred on the building of socialism and communism and the improvement of the living standard of working people;

- socialist revolution in ideology and culture, and the cultivation of an intelligentsia loyal to the working class, the working people and the socialist cause;

- extirpation of the oppression of nationalities and establishment of equality and fraternal friendship among the peoples;

- defence of socialist gains against incursions of external and internal enemies;

- solidarity of the working class of different countries, embodied in proletarian internationalism.

The Declaration reminded Communists of all countries that Marxism-Leninism called for a creative application of all these general principles. It pointed out that the concrete historical conditions, national features and traditions of every country had to be taken into account. Ignoring them would lead to mistakes of a dogmatic and sectarian nature, to isolation from the masses and from living reality. At the same time, it warned, overemphasis on national distinc-

tions would inevitably lead to departure from Marxism-Leninism.

The Meeting recognised the vanguard role played by the Soviet Union in the community of socialist countries.

It stressed that socialist internationalism presupposed the fraternal friendship and mutual assistance of the socialist countries. Unity and selfless mutual support, it pointed out, would facilitate the best possible utilisation of the advantages of the world socialist system.

Socialist Countries Enter a New Stage of Development

The rapid development of the world socialist system radically altered the international position of the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries. The 21st Congress of the CPSU, held in 1959, noted that the Soviet Union was no longer encircled by capitalist states. It noted that there were two social systems in the world—moribund capitalism and rapidly developing, highly viable socialism. The imperialist designs of “flinging back” communism were hopelessly doomed. In the circumstances, the danger of capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union was ruled out, meaning that the triumph of *socialism in the USSR was not only complete but final*.¹

The 21st Congress proclaimed the Soviet Union's entry on a new historic period of development—the period of full-scale building of communist society.

In the People's Democracies, too, the class structure of society had changed radically by 1959. Socialist relations of production reigned undivided in industry. In some countries, the socialist reconstruction of agriculture had also been completed. Some had already embarked on the completion of socialist construction.

A giant battle in the economic field broke out in the world between the two systems.

The socialist community faces the challenge of surpassing capitalism in peaceful competition. This will be the best

¹ Cf. *Control Figures for the Economic Development of the USSR for 1959-65*, Moscow, p. 132.

possible proof of socialism's great superiority over capitalism in material production, the decisive sphere of human endeavour.

Importance of the 1960 Moscow Meeting

The world socialist system was turning into the decisive factor of world social development. This conclusion was drawn by the Moscow Meeting of 81 Communist and Workers' Parties in November 1960 in its analysis of the principal content of the contemporary epoch. Socialism had won decisive victories on the scale of the system as a whole. The socio-economic possibilities of capitalist restoration had been extirpated not only in the Soviet Union, but in other fraternal countries as well. The full victory of socialism within the framework of the socialist community had thus been made secure.

The Moscow Meeting declared that by virtue of the prevailing relation of world forces the time had come when the attempts of the imperialist aggressors to start a new world war could be frustrated. The Statement of the Meeting pointed out that “world war can be prevented by the joint efforts of the world socialist camp, the international working class, the national liberation movement, all the countries opposing war and the peace-loving forces of the world”. Thus, the Meeting confirmed the all-important conclusion drawn by the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

The 1960 Meeting confirmed, too, that the Communist Parties consider the struggle for peace their cardinal task and that “the foreign policy of the socialist countries rests on the firm foundation of the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence and economic competition between the socialist and capitalist countries”.¹

The Meeting voiced full support of the Soviet general and complete disarmament programme and formulated the task of promoting its realisation.

The statement set forth a sweeping programme of struggle for the final and complete abolition of the colonial system, for the vital interests of the working class and other

¹ *The Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism*, Moscow, p. 58.

working people in the capitalist countries, and for the greater unity and cohesion of the world communist and working-class movement.

Continuous strengthening of the unity of the world socialist system, it said, is the key condition for the progressive development of mankind.

The representatives of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties continued the work begun by the previous meeting of generalising the experience of revolutionary reconstruction in the countries of the socialist community. They defined the objective economic laws governing the emergence of the world socialist system and emphasised that the consolidation of this system was largely facilitated by the following factors:

consistent application in every country of the law of planned and proportionate economic development;

promotion of the creative initiative of the masses by close adherence to the Leninist principle of material incentives;

continuous improvement of the system of the socialist international division of labour;

study of the collective experience of all the countries of the community, and its creative application and enrichment to suit specific conditions and national features;

gradual elimination, on the basis of fraternal mutual assistance, of the historically shaped differences in the levels of economic development and creation of a material basis for a more or less simultaneous transition to communism of all the countries of the socialist system.

The speakers at the Moscow Meeting devoted special attention to the struggle against nationalism and national exclusiveness. The grounds for national antagonism, they pointed out, had disappeared in the socialist countries after the abolition of antagonistic classes. Fraternal friendship and mutual assistance of the peoples had come to replace political isolation and national egoism. However, the Statement of the Meeting noted, nationalism and national exclusiveness did not disappear automatically once the socialist system was installed. It was necessary for the Communist Parties to educate the working people perseveringly in the spirit of proletarian internationalism. The Meeting defined as a cardinal task the proper combination in politics of the

principles of internationalism and patriotism. Every Communist Party, it said, was responsible for the destiny of its state, and of the community as a whole.

Further Expansion of Economic Co-operation

The outcome of the struggle of the two world systems depends on their respective rates of development. Socialism has proved by now that it holds the advantage in this respect. Yet success in the further development of the socialist countries hinges largely on the co-ordination of their economic activity. The 20th and 21st congresses of the CPSU called on the fraternal countries to deal with the problem of socialist construction collectively. The 22nd Congress of the CPSU stressed, too, that the way to elevate the world socialist economy rapidly was to combine the national economic efforts of every country with mutual economic assistance.

These important conclusions of the 22nd Congress of the CPSU were prompted by economic realities. In the second half of the 1950s the fraternal countries introduced the practice of holding special conferences on economic co-ordination. Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of countries participating in the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance convened in Moscow in May 1958. Representatives of the Communist Party of China, the Working People's Party of Vietnam, the Korean Party of Labour and the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party also attended. The conference devoted considerable attention to the question of specialising and co-ordinating inter-related economic branches.

Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries convened again in Moscow on February 2-3, 1960, to compare notes on agriculture. The speakers pointed out that the European socialist countries were capable of attaining the world's highest standard of living in a fairly short time. Mutual exchanges of experience and co-ordination of plans were mentioned as the cardinal conditions.

A new conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of the CMEA countries took place in Moscow in June 1962. It

discussed and approved the basic principles of the socialist international division of labour and outlined the prospects of the socialist system.

Lenin had conceived the future co-operation of socialist nations as a single world-wide co-operative which would run its economy according to a common plan. At the 3rd Congress of Workers' Co-operatives, held in 1918, Lenin said: "Now all we need is a single will to enter with an open heart that single world co-operative."¹

Acting on the basic principles of the socialist international division of labour, the CMEA countries framed a programme of concrete measures to promote further co-operation. Co-ordination of national economic plans topped the list. CMEA co-ordinated economic development plans for the five years of 1961-65. At present, spadework has been completed for the co-ordination of plans for 1966-70.

The socialist countries attach great importance to the joint development of electric power systems, oil pipelines, transport routes and the extraction of minerals.

The Druzhba (Friendship) Oil Pipeline has now become a symbol of the single world-wide economic organism conceived by Lenin. The line was put into operation in 1964 and its pipes stretch from the Volga to the Danube and Oder. It is a giant CMEA oil artery. By January 1965, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland and the German Democratic Republic, which had built the pipeline together with the Soviet Union, had already received close on 13 million tons of Soviet oil via Druzhba.

The Soviet Union, Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic and Poland have formed a joint power grid, which they named Mir (Peace). The common railway carriage pool of the CMEA countries began operating in 1964. This pool helps some of the socialist states to transport approximately half their export freight.

One more international organisation, Intermetal, was founded on January 1, 1965, by three countries—Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary. Soon, these were joined by the German Democratic Republic, Bulgaria and the Soviet Union. The purpose of Intermetal is to secure close co-oper-

¹ Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 333.

ation among the socialist countries in developing the iron and steel industry and to pave the way for specialisation.

In the summer of 1963 the Government of Yugoslavia announced its readiness to join in the socialist international division of labour. Yugoslavia and the CMEA countries possess considerable possibilities for mutually advantageous specialisation and co-ordination of production in a number of important industries. At present, Yugoslavia's collaboration with CMEA is making good headway.

Not all CMEA members necessarily join its various international organisations. This is quite natural. Co-operation within the CMEA framework is possible on a bilateral, tripartite and quadrilateral, as well as multilateral, basis. It is up to each individual CMEA country to decide for itself whether it wants to join any of the CMEA organisations. International division of labour does not prejudice the sovereignty of the socialist states and does not contradict the interests of consolidating their respective economies. It is taken into account that specialisation within the CMEA framework depends eminently on existing possibilities and, particularly, on the economic level of every socialist country concerned.

Co-operation in Strengthening the Defences of the Socialist Countries

The problem of security has always been an object of close attention on the part of the socialist community. In the performance of its internationalist duty, the Soviet Union has accepted the bulk of the cost of common defence. The conference of the Political Consultative Committee on May 24, 1958, in Moscow figures prominently among the undertakings of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation. The declaration issued by that conference noted that international developments had borne out the expedience and importance of the Warsaw Treaty. Not only did it safeguard the security and independence of the socialist countries, it said, but also acted as a powerful factor in the struggle for world peace.

The conference welcomed the Soviet Union's unilateral discontinuance of nuclear testing; the decision of the Peo-

ple's Republic of China to withdraw Chinese volunteers from Korea; the proposal of the Polish Government to create in Central Europe a zone free from the manufacture, stationing and use of atomic, nuclear and rocket weapons, and the GDR Government's proposal of an all-German confederation.

The conference exemplified the fact that any demarche by a socialist country in behalf of peace is promptly backed by other socialist countries. Thus, a diplomatic measure designed to reinforce international security, though it may be made by a small country, acquires great weight with the backing of the socialist community.

At their 1958 conference, the Warsaw Treaty countries offered to sign a non-aggression pact with the North Atlantic bloc. The proposal suggested the following commitments:

to refrain from the use or threat of force against each other;

to refrain from any and all interference in each other's internal affairs;

to settle questions in dispute solely by peaceful means in a spirit of understanding and justice through negotiation by the countries concerned;

to hold mutual consultations in the event of situations liable to imperil European peace.

Although the idea of this pact was repugned by the North Atlantic bloc bosses, its urgency persists. Again and again, the socialist countries show their determination to promote the principles of peaceful coexistence in their relations with the capitalist countries.

The Warsaw Treaty Organisation is deeply conscious of the peril presented by the revenge-seeking forces of the Federal Republic of Germany. Time and again, the decisions of the Political Consultative Committee stressed the need for eliminating the survivals of the Second World War by means of a peace settlement with Germany. The Warsaw Treaty Organisation keeps a wary eye on the manoeuvres of the militarist forces in West Berlin, who gravely imperil peace.

Anxiety was aroused in the socialist countries by Western plans of giving Bonn access to weapons of mass annihilation through a projected NATO multilateral nuclear force. Problems stemming from these dangerous plans were discussed

by the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Treaty countries on January 19-20, 1965.

The PCC pointed out once again that the main purpose of the Warsaw Treaty members was to secure peace for the building of socialism and communism in their respective countries and to deliver mankind from the threat of a world nuclear war. It stressed that the unity of the socialist countries is, as before, one of the most important factors for successful struggle against the war threat.

The communique issued by the PCC said:

"The Political Consultative Committee declares that the socialist countries stand united and solid in face of the imperialist threat and that imperialist attempts to disrupt this solidarity are doomed to failure."¹

Cuba's Entry into the Family of Socialist Nations. Soviet-Cuban Relations

The heroic struggle of the Cuban people against the blood-stained dictator Batista, a puppet of the US monopolies, culminated in a complete victory on January 1, 1959. A revolutionary government came to power. On February 16, Fidel Castro, leader of the Cuban revolutionary forces, was made Cuba's Prime Minister. The new government gave the people extensive democratic rights and launched measures to improve the living standard. It framed a sweeping programme of economic and social reconstruction.

In an environment of acute class struggle, Cuba carried through an agrarian reform and nationalised industry, the big commercial firms, banks and railways. On April 16, 1961, Fidel Castro was able to say:

"We have accomplished a socialist revolution."

The special feature about the socialist revolution in Cuba is that it was accomplished in an environment of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

The Soviet Government recognised People's Cuba on January 10, 1959. From that day on, Soviet-Cuban relations developed on a basis of fraternity and friendship.

¹ *Pravda*, Jan. 22, 1965.

In February 1960, during the stay in Havana of a Soviet Government delegation, agreements were concluded to lay the foundation for close economic co-operation. A trade agreement provided for Soviet purchases of 425,000 tons of Cuban sugar in 1960 and a million tons annually in the next four years in exchange for Soviet commodities. This was immensely important for Cuba, because the United States, formerly the chief consumer of her sugar, had at first reduced its sugar purchases by 856,000 tons and later completely ceased sugar imports from Cuba. The Soviet Union gave Cuba \$100 million worth of credit to purchase equipment and material, and to pay for Soviet technical assistance in the building of industrial enterprises.

A fresh round of Soviet-Cuban negotiations took place in June 1960. They culminated in an agreement for shipments to Cuba of Soviet crude oil and oil products, which did a lot to invigorate Cuba's economy, eliminating its dependence on imports of US oil. This deprived the United States of yet one more means of pressuring the revolutionary government.

Seeing that the US imperialists were intent on touching off an armed aggression against Cuba, the Soviet Government declared on July 9, 1960, that the Soviet Union would employ all means at its disposal to support Cuba and her gallant people in the struggle for freedom and national independence. Soviet people voiced their fraternal solidarity with the heroic Cuban people and promised to extend them all-round assistance.

In September 1961, Osvaldo Dorticós Torrado, President of the Republic of Cuba, visited the USSR. The results of the exchange of opinion on international problems and on specific issues concerning Soviet-Cuban relations were recorded in a joint communique. The communique noted the identity of Soviet and Cuban views on international problems. The Soviet side declared its support of the heroic Cuban people and their government, fighting to consolidate Cuba's independence and to realise the ideals and purposes of the revolution. The Cuban Government expressed its gratitude for Soviet solidarity and assistance.

The 22nd Congress of the CPSU emphasised the immense historical impact of the Cuban revolution, which, it said,

became "an inextinguishable beacon of freedom, lighting the way to progress for all the peoples of Latin America". The Congress declared once again that the Cubans could rely firmly on Soviet assistance.

Trade and economic relations between the USSR and Cuba continued to expand. In 1962, the trade turnover climbed to the impressive sum of more than 500 million rubles, accounting for more than 40 per cent of Cuba's foreign trade.

The USSR is helping Cuba economically and technically in developing her nickel, chemical, metallurgical and engineering industries, building power stations and educational centres, and prospecting for minerals.

In September 1962, the two countries concluded an agreement on Soviet assistance in the building of a fishing port in Cuba. An agreement was also reached on the extension of the Cuban melioration and irrigation scheme.

Close co-operation has been achieved in agriculture. A large group of young Soviet farm mechanics went to Cuba. Working on the people's estates, these young men shared their skills and experience with the Cuban peasants. In addition, several thousand Cubans attended Soviet-farming schools. They went home equipped with extensive agricultural knowledge.

The Soviet Union is also helping to train personnel for other branches of the Cuban economy and sending highly competent specialists to provide technical aid on the spot. Besides, it has helped organise training of national personnel at Cuban educational centres.

In autumn 1963, when Cuba suffered a natural calamity, the Soviet Union gave her additional material assistance. Planes and ships were dispatched urgently to Cuba with medical supplies, food, clothing, footwear, building materials and equipment. In 1964, the Soviet Union provided Cuba with complete equipment for a plant prefabricating house parts.

The fraternal solicitude of the Soviet Union was received by Cubans with enthusiasm and gratitude. Nicolás Guillén, a prominent Cuban poet, wrote in *Noticias de Hoy*:

"Once again the Soviet Union has shown the world what socialist solidarity and proletarian internationalism is really like."

The help of Soviet specialists in mechanising the harvesting of sugar cane is especially vital for the Cuban Republic. Soviet-designed cane-loaders passed practical tests, and cane-harvesting combines were developed at short notice by Soviet engineers.

The militant solidarity of the peoples of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries with revolutionary Cuba was demonstrated more strikingly still during the piratical invasion by Cuban émigrés armed and trained in the United States (April 1961) and, particularly, at the time of the Caribbean crisis touched off by the US imperialists (October 1962). At that time, the Soviet Union rendered extensive and highly effective assistance to the people of Cuba (see Chapter VI).

The visit to the Soviet Union of Fidel Castro Ruz, First Secretary of the National Leadership of the United Party of Socialist Revolution and Prime Minister of the Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba, in April-June 1963, had a strong bearing on the further consolidation of the fraternal friendship of the Soviet and Cuban peoples.

Fidel Castro visited big industrial centres, building sites, state and collective farms, educational, research and cultural institutions, and acquainted himself with the experience of communist construction in the USSR. The Soviet people received the leader of heroic Cuba with great warmth and fraternal hospitality.

In a public speech on returning to Havana, Fidel Castro said:

"We shall continue the fight in concert with the world communist movement. The imperialists are crazy if they think they can pull us away from the socialist camp by even an inch. . . . We are Communists and we belong in the socialist camp. Our lot is tied up with the lot of all Communists, with the world communist movement, with the communist revolution."

In January 1964, Fidel Castro paid a second visit to the Soviet Union. An exhaustive exchange of opinion reaffirmed the complete identity of views concerning the further strengthening and development of Soviet-Cuban friendship and co-operation, international problems and the current issues of the world communist and working-class movement.

A joint Soviet-Cuban communique (published on January 23, 1964) noted that the genuine fraternal relations prevailing between the USSR and Cuba, and between the CPSU and the United Party of Socialist Revolution, had gained added strength.

A long-term agreement for 1964-70 was signed during Castro's visit on deliveries of Cuban sugar to the Soviet Union at a fixed price. This safeguards Cuba's economy against price fluctuations and the economic subversion of the US monopolists. Besides, it gives added scope to Cuba's long-term economic planning and the prospects of improving the living standard of her people.

The building of socialism in Cuba proceeds in an environment of continuous acts of aggression on the part of US imperialist groups. Washington persists in its policy of economic blockade and gives money and arms to mercenaries for an attack on Cuba. Seeking to involve Latin American countries in its aggressive plans, the United States has saddled the Organisation of American States with a resolution on so-called collective sanctions against Cuba. In the circumstances, the revolutionary Republic has had to take fresh steps to strengthen her international position. Prominent among these is Cuba's active participation in the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held in Cairo in October 1964. The Conference backed Cuba's right to consolidate and develop the social system of her own choosing. The decisions of the representative international forum stressed that Cuba's demand concerning the abolition of the US war base in Guantanamo is totally legitimate and justified, and that the United States has no grounds whatsoever to reject it.

Strengthening of the Unity of Socialist Forces Is the Sacred Duty of All Communists

The economic and political positions of the world socialist system are getting stronger, and its influence on the destiny of mankind is growing steadily. The international relations of each of the socialist countries are expanding continuously. At the beginning of 1965, Albania maintained

diplomatic relations with 32 countries, Bulgaria with 65, Hungary 64, the German Democratic Republic 13, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam 27, the Korean People's Democratic Republic 25, the People's Republic of China 50, Cuba 56, Mongolia 31, Poland 75, Rumania 63, the Soviet Union 95, Czechoslovakia 75 and Yugoslavia with 86 countries.

The stronger position of the socialist community and of the other detachments of the world revolutionary movement constitutes a major trend of modern world development. The surest guarantee that this trend will continue to operate lies, first and foremost, in the consolidation of the unity and cohesion of the socialist countries.

In the last few years, differences have arisen in the world communist movement over questions of revolutionary theory and practice. Developments showed that the emergence of the new type of international relations is a complicated process, creating serious problems, differences and difficulties.

Analysing the causes of the differences, we must, apart from subjective factors, also take account of such objective points as the considerable distinctions from country to country in historical traditions, political conditions and socio-economic levels. This prompts different approaches to the various problems of domestic and foreign policy.

The only way to iron out the differences is to base them on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, proletarian internationalism and the collectively framed documents of the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Meetings of Communist and Workers' Parties. The Soviet Government and the CPSU are doing their utmost to put the difficulties between the various socialist countries out of the way.

After the Plenary Meeting of the CC CPSU in October 1964 the Soviet Union took a number of fresh steps in this direction. Prominent among these was the Consultative Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow, March 1-5, 1965. Its participants declared that what united the Communist Parties was much stronger than what disunited them. Even in the face of differences over theory and practice it was possible and necessary to work for *united action* in the struggle against imperialism, the common enemy, for communism, the common goal. The

Meeting also recognised that exchanges of opinion on the pressing problems of our time should be continued in a comradely spirit. Whether a position is right or wrong can be proved only by the practical experience of socialist and communist construction, the experience of the whole revolutionary movement.

The documents of the Consultative Meeting were welcomed by the vast majority of Communist Parties. At its Plenum in March 1965, the Central Committee of the CPSU adopted a special decision, "On the Outcome of the Consultative Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, March 1-5, 1965". This decision said:

"The Plenary Meeting of the CC CPSU expresses complete agreement with the opinion of the participants in the Meeting that the principal way of strengthening unity is for every Communist Party to enhance its internationalist responsibility, and its participation in joint actions in the common struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism in support of the liberation struggle of the peoples, against the domination of monopoly capitalism, for world peace and the promotion of the principles of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, for the socialist and communist cause".

The CPSU cultivates among the Soviet people the spirit of fraternal solidarity with the peoples building socialism. The Leninist policy of the 20th-22nd congresses of the CPSU and the Party Programme are based completely on the principles of socialist internationalism.

The CC CPSU and the Soviet Government consider it a sacred duty to develop political, economic and cultural relations with every socialist country.

Considerable success has been achieved over the last few years in extending Soviet-Polish friendship. The new Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance signed by the Soviet Union and Poland on April 8, 1965, has gone a long way in invigorating the alliance of the two nations.

Bonds of fraternity and co-operation are growing stronger between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia. In November 1963, during a visit to the Soviet Union of a Party and Government delegation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the partners discussed prolonging the

Treaty of December 12, 1943, whose 20-year term was due to expire. The governments of the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia emphasised that the Treaty had been an important factor of peace in Europe and of friendship between the peoples of the two countries. A protocol was signed on November 27, 1963, renewing the treaty for another 20 years. The protocol stressed the importance of the allied commitments, which are imbued with a desire for peace.

Speaking of current Soviet-Czechoslovak relations, Antonín Novotný, President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, said on February 24, 1965:

"Our dependable alliance with the Soviet Union and our country's membership in the Warsaw Treaty Organisation give us a sense of confidence and security in face of possible aggression. This sense of confidence is something we have never had before."¹

Constant Soviet concern for the fraternal unity of the socialist countries is strikingly illustrated by the Soviet-Bulgarian friendship.

A Party and Government delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria headed by Todor Zhivkov, First Secretary of the CC BCP and Chairman of the PRB Council of Ministers, paid a friendly visit to the Soviet Union on February 16-21, 1964. The Soviet and Bulgarian leaders emphasised during the negotiations that Soviet-Bulgarian relations, based on the principles of true fraternity, were going from strength to strength.

The joint Soviet-Bulgarian statement issued on February 21, 1964, outlined ways and means of extending political, economic and cultural ties between the two countries. An inter-governmental Soviet-Bulgarian commission was projected to promote economic, scientific and technical collaboration. This organ will increase to a still greater degree the economic relations not only of the Soviet Union and Bulgaria, but also of the rest of the socialist community. The Soviet Government granted Bulgaria a new long-term credit of 300 million rubles on easy terms.

Key problems of Soviet-Bulgarian relations were discussed in a candid and friendly spirit during the stay

¹ *Pravda*, Feb. 27, 1965.

in the USSR of G. Traikov, Chairman of the Presidium of the People's Assembly of the PRB in May 1965 and during the visit to Bulgaria of a CPSU delegation headed by Mikhail Suslov (end of May-beginning of June 1965). It might be noted that visits of this kind have become an important means of invigorating the unity of the socialist countries.

One of the main purposes of such personal visits is to compare notes on socialist construction and to exchange opinions on the urgent problems. Learning of each other's achievements in politics, economy and culture enables the Communist Parties to utilise creatively the accumulated experience in the specific conditions of their own land.

Soviet-Hungarian relations are making good headway. People's Hungary has set its sights on completing the building of socialist society. In this great cause it can depend, as before, on the fraternal aid of the peoples of the Soviet Union.

At the close of May 1965, a delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic headed by Janos Kadar arrived on a friendly visit to the Soviet Union. The leaders of the CPSU and the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party briefed each other on the progress of socialist and communist construction, and exchanged opinions on the further expansion of Soviet-Hungarian contacts. Agreement was reached on specific economic measures for 1966-70.

The increasing friendship of the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic serves the interests of the entire world socialist system. In 1964 and 1965, the two fraternal countries exchanged visits at summit level. Speaking in May 1965 at a sitting in Berlin on the 20th anniversary of Germany's liberation from fascism, Alexei Kosygin stressed that "loyal to the principles of socialist internationalism and to our Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Co-operation, the Soviet Union will defend the frontiers of the GDR as it would its own".

With the support of the fraternal countries, the German Democratic Republic has made great strides in her economic development. By 1965 her industry was producing as much as all pre-war Germany. The Soviet people rejoice sincerely over the outstanding successes of the German

people, who are building socialism in the land of Marx and Engels.

Fruitful, mutually advantageous Soviet-GDR co-operation in economy, culture, science and technology is making good headway. The Soviet Union accounts for almost half the GDR's foreign trade. A protocol on mutual commodity deliveries concluded in Moscow in 1965 provided for a turnover worth 2,500 million rubles. This surpasses the 1950 commodity turnover eight times over.

The increasing economic contacts of the two countries stimulate the building of socialism and communism.

The Soviet Union adheres strictly to fraternal principles in its relations with socialist Rumania. Rumania's economic development has benefited from her friendship with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. The Soviet Government and the CC CPSU are ever ready to strengthen unity with Rumania.

"Between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Rumania, between Soviet and Rumanian Communists," Leonid Brezhnev said at the 9th Congress of the Rumanian Communist Party on July 20, 1965, "there have long existed traditional friendly relations based on a deep-going identity of interests. We state to the delegates of the Congress of Rumanian Communists that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will continue unswervingly to maintain its line of strengthening and developing fraternal relations between the USSR and socialist Rumania."

In the last few years considerable success was achieved in expanding Soviet-Yugoslav relations. The CPSU and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia are both eager to iron out their differences on the ideological questions referred to in the decisions of the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Meetings of Communist and Workers' Parties.

Economic and cultural relations with the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia are making perceptible headway. The Soviet Union and Yugoslavia hold common views in regard to key international issues.

Negotiations between government delegations of the USSR and Yugoslavia concerning further economic co-operation took place in Moscow from June 2 to 7, 1965. The two sides agreed that such co-operation would promote economic development, technical progress and greater

friendship. Concrete measures were discussed to extend Soviet-Yugoslav economic contacts. It was decided to form an Inter-Governmental Committee for Economic Co-operation.

Fresh opportunities for a further strengthening of Soviet-Yugoslav friendship on the basis of socialist internationalism came to hand during the stay in the USSR of President Josip Broz Tito in the summer of 1965. The joint Soviet-Yugoslav statement signed on June 30, 1965, reflected the desire of the two countries to develop fraternal contacts with each other and the other socialist countries. Special mention was made of the benefits to the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia of exchanging delegations from public, political, economic, cultural, scientific, professional and other organisations.

Relations with the Albanian People's Republic leave much to be desired. The Soviet Government is eager to normalise its relations with Albania on the basis of proletarian internationalism and loyalty to the agreed line of the world communist movement.

The Soviet Union shows constant concern for strengthening fraternal ties with the socialist countries of Asia.

The Mongolian People's Republic is making rapid headway thanks to her close association with the Soviet Union. In a relatively short period of history her people have put an end to their age-long backwardness and have by-passed the capitalist stage of development in attaining the threshold of socialism.

An important part in Soviet-Mongolian relations is played by the Treaty of Friendship and Mutual Assistance and the Economic and Cultural Co-operation Agreement concluded in 1946. The Treaty was renewed during the visit of a Soviet Party and Government delegation headed by Leonid Brezhnev to Ulan-Bator in January 1966.

The visit of a Soviet delegation headed by Alexei Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the People's Republic of China in February 1965 has done a lot to strengthen the world socialist community. The talks of the Soviet delegation with the leaders of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Korean People's Democratic Republic, and

its meetings with the working people of the two countries, showed that immense opportunities existed for a further expansion of fraternal Soviet-Vietnamese and Soviet-Korean relations.

During its conversations with the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party and the People's Republic of China in February 1965, the Soviet delegation stressed that the Soviet Union was set squarely on the Leninist course put forward by the 20th-22nd congresses of the CPSU and that the Soviet side was prepared to do its utmost to overcome the difficulties that prevail in its relations with the People's Republic of China. However, all too obviously, the solution of this problem depends not only on the USSR.

At present, when joint action is essential to repulse the US imperialists who have created a dangerous seat of war in Vietnam, greater cohesion and unity of all the socialist countries is doubly necessary.

The Soviet Government condemns the US aggression. What is more, it renders the Vietnamese people effective moral and material support. During the stay of the Soviet delegation headed by Kosygin in Hanoi (February 1965) and of Vietnamese spokesmen in Moscow (April 1965) an understanding was reached on additional free aid to strengthen the defences of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. The Soviet Government and the public at large render full political backing to the liberation struggle of the people of South Vietnam. Here is what the leaders of the national liberation movement in South Vietnam say about Soviet assistance:

"In the war against the US imperialist aggressors and their henchmen, a war for the liberation of South Vietnam waged in the name of national reunification, the people of South Vietnam receive enthusiastically all the sympathy and support of the Soviet Government and the fraternal Soviet people. The people of South Vietnam appreciate this support dearly and regard it as a strong stimulus in their righteous struggle."

The other socialist countries, too, are rendering the Vietnamese people versatile assistance. In the present circumstances, all Communist and Workers' Parties ought to ap-

preciate their internationalist responsibility and the need for unity in the common struggle against imperialism.

In their relations with the socialist countries, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Soviet Government and the entire Soviet people are guided by the principles of socialist internationalism, friendship, co-operation and mutual assistance based on complete equality, strict and unflinching respect of the interests of every country and the proper combination of these interests with the common interests of the world socialist system.

CHAPTER III
THE SOVIET UNION
AND THE ASIAN COUNTRIES
LENINIST PRINCIPLES OF RELATIONS
WITH THE EASTERN COUNTRIES

Lenin attached great importance to the theory and practice of the relationship between the world's first socialist power and the countries of the East. Time and again, he pointed to the direct connection between the struggle of the working class for socialism and the struggle of the oppressed peoples for independence. Soviet power in Russia, he stressed, spurs the final development of the oppressed peoples into an active factor of world politics and of the revolutionary demolition of imperialism.

The Soviet state, Lenin held, had to give every assistance to the liberation movement and to establish fraternal cooperation with the oppressed peoples in the fight against colonialism and imperialism. He required Soviet diplomats to expose colonialist policies and to work constantly for the right of the peoples to self-determination, to economic and political independence. He advocated the principles of equality and sovereignty and consideration for national features. He urged Soviet diplomats to explain patiently that joint action against imperialism was absolutely essential.

"Our policy in relation to West European countries has been very cautious," Lenin said in February 1920, "but our policy in the East must be even more cautious and patient, for here we are dealing with countries that are much more backward, are under the oppressive influence of religious fanaticism, are imbued with greater distrust of the Russian people, and for decades and centuries were oppressed

by the tsarist government's capitalist and imperialist policy."¹

Lenin's demand that Eastern countries participate on an equal footing in international affairs is imbued with deep respect for the awakening peoples and an appreciation of their role in the world. It reflects the new, socialist point of view on the development of international relations, which takes account of the inevitable collapse of the colonial system and the winning of political and economic independence by the peoples of the East.

Lenin wrote:

"It is unquestionable that the proletariat of the advanced countries can and should give help to the working masses of the backward countries, and that the backward countries can emerge from their present stage of development when the victorious proletariat of the Soviet Republics extends a helping hand to these masses and is in a position to give them support."²

This was said at a time when Soviet Russia had practically no resources itself, while most of the Eastern countries were still colonies. But when Lenin defined selfless political, economic and cultural assistance to underdeveloped countries as a principle of state policy, he knew the Soviet state would deal with the problem in earnest and give the former colonies a hand up in developing their economy.

From the very first, the Soviet Government acted on Lenin's instructions in all its practical affairs. In its appeal, "To All Working Moslems of Russia and the East", on December 3, 1917, it declared:

"You yourselves must be masters of your country! You yourselves must arrange your life according to your liking! You have the right to it, because your destiny is in your own hands."³

As Lenin wrote to the Emir of Afghanistan, Amanullah Khan, Soviet Russia "proffered a hand of friendship and fraternity to all the peoples of the East".⁴ Soviet Russia

¹ Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 325.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 31, pp. 243-44.

³ *Dokumenty vneshnei politiki SSSR*, Vol. I, Gospolitizdat, p. 35.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 94.

annulled all the unequal imperialist treaties and agreements imposed on various countries by the tsarist government.

The USSR helped the Mongolian people by political, economic and military means to win independence and make their transition to socialism by-passing capitalist development. Soviet support has enabled Afghanistan, Turkey and Iran to safeguard their sovereignty and consolidate their national economy.

Acting on Lenin's instructions, the Soviet Government has always strictly adhered to the principle of respect for the sovereignty of Eastern countries, and helped them combat imperialist intrigues. The instructions of the People's Foreign Affairs Commissariat of the RSFSR to the plenipotentiary Soviet representative in Afghanistan read:

"We say, we have one system, and you have another; we have one ideal, and you have another; however, we are bound by our common aspirations for complete independence. We do not interfere in your internal affairs and do not intrude on the endeavours of your people; we support everything that plays a progressive role in the development of your people."¹

Sun Yat-sen, the great Chinese democrat, held in high esteem the fraternal assistance rendered by the Soviet Union to the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples. In a letter to the Central Executive Committee of the USSR, he stressed:

"You stand at the head of the union of free republics—the legacy which immortal Lenin left the oppressed peoples of the world. With the help of this legacy, the victims of imperialism will inevitably achieve liberation from the international system whose roots go back to slave-ownership, wars and injustices."²

As we have already said, the victory of the USSR in the Second World War had a decisive bearing on the national liberation movement. In their struggle for independence, oppressed peoples relied on the all-round assistance of the USSR.

In the United Nations, at international conferences, in diplomatic negotiations and in special statements, the So-

¹ *Dokumenty vneshnei politiki SSSR*, Vol. IV, p. 167.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. VIII p. 188.

viet Government shows up the colonialists in their true colours and demands immediate recognition of the right of the oppressed peoples to decide their future by themselves. This has helped to discredit completely all colonial policies, and frustrated attempts to perpetuate imperialist domination in Asia and Africa by partial concessions and reforms.

By opposing the use of armed force by the imperialists to safeguard their colonial regimes, the Soviet Union is bringing closer the final breakdown of colonialism and assisting the birth of new sovereign states.

At the 15th UN General Assembly in 1960 the Soviet Union proposed that the United Nations demand that "all colonial countries and Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories must be granted forthwith complete independence and freedom . . . and strongholds of colonialism in the form of possessions and leased areas in the territory of other States must be eliminated".

Despite the resistance of the colonialists, the General Assembly adopted a Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The Declaration said that subjugation and exploitation of peoples are incompatible with the principles of the United Nations and the consolidation of peace. "Inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness," it noted, "should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence." The United Nations demanded that all actions obstructing the exercise of the right to full independence be combated.

The Soviet Government warned against the illusion that imperialists would be only too pleased to grant freedom to their colonies. It pointed out that persevering efforts were required to have the Declaration realised.

In 1961, at the 16th General Assembly, the Soviet delegation exposed the slander that colonies were unable to govern themselves and said there were no peoples today unprepared for freedom, only peoples forcibly deprived of it. In 1962, at the 17th General Assembly, the Soviet Union insisted on the fixing of specific dates for the final abolition of colonialism.

The imperialist powers are resisting the implementation of the 1960 General Assembly Declaration. However, the efforts of the Soviet Union and all the other peace-loving

countries have already yielded palpable results. Between 1961 and 1965, colonial government was abolished in 20 possessions, which have become sovereign states or, by consent of their populations, part of neighbouring countries in Asia and Africa.

Besides moral and political support, the Soviet Union renders the fighting peoples effective material aid, including shipments of arms.

The emergence of young independent states created fresh opportunities for greater Soviet co-operation with Asian and African countries on the basis worked out by Lenin. However, during the Stalin cult period these opportunities were not exploited to the full.

The CPSU has developed Lenin's principles of relations with Eastern countries to fit present conditions. The 20th, 21st and 22nd congresses of the CPSU defined the role of the independent Asian and African states as a serious factor of peace and anti-imperialist struggle, pointing out that the basic issues of world politics could "no longer be settled without" them.¹ The Programme of the CPSU reasserts the necessity of strengthening "relations of fraternal friendship and close co-operation with the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America which are fighting to attain or consolidate national independence, with all peoples and states that advocate the preservation of peace".²

The Soviet Union is helping the young states in strengthening their independence and realising their national aspirations. On many occasions, it has taken determined action to defend the young states against imperialist intrigues. The Soviet Union helped squash military ventures against Egypt, Syria, the Lebanon, Tunisia, Indonesia, Laos, Cuba, etc.

The Soviet Government has considerably extended its business relations with Asian and African countries, especially those that follow a progressive foreign and domestic policy. Soviet friendship with these countries is based on common views concerning the main international problems—the maintenance and consolidation of peace, and the struggle against imperialism and colonialism. It is based

¹ *The Road to Communism*, p. 41.

² *Ibid.*, p. 507.

on a sincere desire to co-operate in consolidating the independence of the new states. Soviet relations with the newly free countries are an important international factor. Joint action by the Soviet Union and the young states is blunting the threat of a new world war and international tension, and brings nearer the day of the final collapse of colonialism.

Foreign Policy of Independent Developing Countries

When imperialism dominated the world, the politically independent Eastern states were unable to pursue an independent foreign policy and use their sovereignty to safeguard their national interest. Such nominally sovereign states as China, Turkey and Iran were objects of imperialist rivalry and their foreign policy largely depended on the wishes of the Great Power which held the strongest position.

After the October Revolution in Russia, when they gained the support of the Soviet Republic, the Eastern countries won the opportunity of acting more independently in international affairs.

Thanks to the radical change in the relation of forces after the Second World War, the Asian and African states are able to follow a totally independent course.

Many countries describe their foreign policy as one of neutralism or non-alignment. The most salient feature of this policy, prompted by the objective needs of the economic and political development of the new states, is their allegiance to peace. They reject participation in imperialist-sponsored aggressive blocs and work for the banning of nuclear weapons and for general and complete disarmament. They oppose military bases in foreign territories and call for the peaceful settlement of all disputes. Most of them acclaim the principle of peaceful coexistence and promote it by their policy.

The neutralist foreign policy is anti-colonial. It is aimed against the efforts of the Western monopolies to maintain their positions by old and new methods. Their identity of interests in the struggle for independence and peace impels mutual co-operation among Afro-Asian states.

The peoples of the young developing countries favour progressive neutralist policy and work for its consistent implementation. Their actions reduce the influence of domestic pro-imperialist groups, compel the national bourgeoisie at the helm of the country to resist imperialist pressure and counteract its vacillations and inconsistencies.

The facts confirm the conclusion defined in the Programme of the CPSU:

"The time has come when the peoples of those countries, breaking the resistance of the reactionary circles and those connected with the colonialists, and overcoming the vacillation of the national bourgeoisie, can put their resources at the service of universal security and become a new bulwark of peace. This is what their own fundamental interests and the interests of all peoples demand."¹

The friendly relations that have always prevailed between the Soviet Union and the peoples of the East have of late developed into enduring and versatile co-operation. The way to it was paved by the Soviet Union's economic successes, which extended its economic contacts and enabled it to safeguard the developing countries from aggression. The consolidation of their independence and the neutralist policy of the new states have also facilitated their closer ties with the Soviet Union. Soviet foreign policy, too, has played a prominent part in stimulating friendly relations.

It was on Soviet initiative that personal contacts have expanded between statesmen of the Soviet Union and those of the developing Eastern countries. A start was made in 1955, when the late Jawaharlal Nehru, then Prime Minister of India, visited the Soviet Union on the invitation of the Soviet Government. In later years, meetings between heads of state and government became a regular affair, highlighting relations between the Soviet Union and Eastern states. Visits of Soviet statesmen between 1955 and 1965 to India, Indonesia, the United Arab Republic, Pakistan, and many other Asian and African countries have gone a long way in strengthening peace and good-neighbour relations.

They facilitated the solution of many practical issues and promoted mutual understanding in regard to various

¹ *The Road to Communism*, p. 496.

international problems. In joint documents, the Soviet Union and the neutralist countries emphasised their readiness to co-operate in the struggle for peace and the abolition of colonialism.

The Soviet-Algerian communique of May 7, 1964, for example, voiced the determination of the parties concerned "to continue the struggle against the threat of a world war, against colonialism and imperialism, for a peaceful life, for social progress, for the freedom and national independence of all peoples". It stressed the two countries' "allegiance to the policy of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems".¹

The Soviet Union and Algeria voiced their desire to settle disputes with other states by peaceful means only, and to hold appropriate meetings for this purpose.

The joint statements describe the common stand on problems of special importance for the relaxation of international tension. Joint statements and action taken by the Soviet Union and the newly independent countries help to isolate the aggressive forces and to consolidate the international position of the young Asian and African states.

Soviet Economic Relations with the Developing Countries

Economic contacts are gaining ever greater prominence in the relations between the Soviet Union and the developing countries. As a socialist state, the Soviet Union is not interested in receiving any political or economic advantages from them. The Soviet Government adheres firmly to the principle of equality. It is the internationalist duty of the USSR to help the developing countries overcome economic backwardness, the result of long colonial rule. The Soviet Union strives sincerely to help formerly oppressed peoples end as quickly as possible their dependence on the imperialists and build up their economies on the basis of modern industry, without which it is impossible to secure a higher living standard for their populations.

It is these noble aims that are behind the Soviet assistance, which is based on agreements for economic and

¹ *Pravda*, May 7, 1964.

technical co-operation and credit. The USSR has concluded such agreements with more than 20 Asian, African and Latin American states. The Soviet Government makes credits available on easy terms: 2-2.5 per cent annual interest (while bourgeois financiers charge 4.5-5.5 per cent and more) for a term of twelve years, repayable in the national currency. Soviet credits granted between 1955 and 1965 added up to more than 3,000 million rubles. Under these credits, Soviet organisations fulfil surveying and designing jobs, manufacture and deliver equipment, and provide technical guidance. Six hundred projects have been, or are being, built with Soviet assistance, including 34 metallurgical and more than 30 engineering and metalworking plants, 20 power stations, more than 20 oil-refining and chemical works, and the like. Among these industrial projects is the iron and steel giant in Bhilai (India), the High Aswan Dam (United Arab Republic), and major modern factories in Indonesia, Mali and many other countries. The projects built with Soviet co-operation in the developing Asian and African countries will increase their production capacity for steel by 6,100,000 tons, oil refining by 8,600,000 tons and electric power by 4,700,000 kw. Soviet engineers, technicians and workers are training national cadres to operate these projects.

The Soviet Union offers extensive opportunities to students from developing countries who enrol in its higher educational establishments. The Patrice Lumumba University, opened in Moscow in 1960, is training specialists in all fields of science and technology for Asia, Africa and Latin America.

As a rule, the Western governments are no longer able to lay down the law to the young states and are compelled to agree to concessions they never countenanced in the past. Not only are they forced to increase their financial aid, but sometimes even to finance heavy industrial projects. In the late forties, for example, India attempted to obtain credits from Britain and the United States for the building of a modern iron and steel enterprise. Yet it was not until after the Soviet Union offered to help build such an enterprise (in Bhilai) that British firms agreed to co-operate, while West German firms abandoned a number of prejudicial conditions contained in an agreement signed

earlier. As a result, India received credits on more acceptable terms for the building of three enterprises.

Partial concessions cannot, of course, alter the substance of imperialism's economic policies in the developing countries, aimed at safeguarding semi-colonial exploitation. But a fact is a fact: the support of the socialist countries (both direct and indirect) created favourable conditions for the development of national industries and for repelling imperialist intrigues in the Asian, African and Latin American states.

The Soviet Union calls for greater assistance to the young countries. At the 17th General Assembly in 1962, the Soviet delegation proposed that a declaration be passed on employing for peaceful needs the means and resources released through disarmament. If just one-fifth of the means spent in the world for military purposes were used to help the developing countries, they would annually be about \$20,000 million to the good.

Trade plays an important role in the Soviet Union's economic relations with the developing countries. The Soviet Union supplies them with manufactured goods on a mutually advantageous basis and purchases their traditional exports, which often have no buyers in the capitalist countries due to competition. Unlike many Western powers, the Soviet Union is willing to make commercial settlements in local currency. Countries lacking surplus foreign exchange or gold are highly benefited thereby. Contacts with the socialist market enable them to fight the economic arm-twisting of the monopolies. To make Egypt toe the line, the Western powers have, for example, stopped buying Egyptian cotton (her main item of export). So the Soviet Union and other socialist countries bought something like one-half or two-thirds of her cotton, supplying machinery and equipment in return. This helped to blast the economic blockade of Egypt. By buying a large quantity of Burman rice in 1955, the Soviet Union helped Burma extricate herself from the grave difficulties artificially created by US rice deliveries to Asian countries.

The political, economic and cultural co-operation of the Soviet Union with the young states is going from strength to strength. It has developed into an important factor of

international relations, promoting peace and progress. To maintain and expand this co-operation is one of the most important targets of Soviet foreign policy.

**USSR WORKS FOR THE PEACE AND SECURITY
OF THE PEOPLES OF THE FAR EAST
AND SOUTHEAST ASIA**

**Ending the Wars in Korea and Indochina
Is a Success for the Peace-Loving Forces**

In 1950, the imperialists started a war in Korea. They wanted to sound out the frontiers of the socialist community, to wipe out the Korean People's Democratic Republic, to set the scene for the Kuomintang's return to China and, generally, to torpedo the liberation movement of the oppressed peoples. Britain, France and a few other countries joined the United States in the aggression. Their actions were covered by the flag of the United Nations, for in 1950-51 they succeeded in pushing through a resolution accusing the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the People's Republic of China of "aggression" and allowing them to call the interventionist armies "troops of the United Nations".

The stand of the Soviet Union, China, the Korean People's Democratic Republic and other socialist countries broke up the imperialists' aggressive designs. The Korean people, and the Chinese volunteers who came to help them, routed the interventionists within the territory of North Korea at the close of 1950 and then clung firmly to positions near the 38th parallel. The selfless assistance and the economic and military power of the Soviet Union, and the willingness of the Soviet Union to fulfil its commitments under the Soviet-Chinese Treaty of Alliance of 1950 restrained the United States from attacking China and employing nuclear weapons in the Korean war.

Soviet Government statements and Soviet spokesmen in the United Nations, as well as the Soviet press, listed undeniable facts about the war having been prepared by the United States and its South Korean puppets, and revealed the unlawful character of the UN resolutions which encour-

aged the imperialist aggression. The Soviet Government demanded that foreign interference in Korea cease immediately and the Korean people be given a chance to decide their own future. In August 1950, a Soviet spokesman in the Security Council submitted a proposal for a cease-fire and the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea. The proposal was repeated at the 5th General Assembly later in the year. The United States and its allies prevented this Soviet proposal from being approved. All the same, the ensuing debate exposed the imperialist policy of prolonging and expanding the war. The Soviet stand helped to isolate the aggressors and prompted a number of Asian countries to come out actively against the Korean war. It also accentuated the differences that prevailed between the United States and its allies.

In June 1951, the Soviet Union again called on the combatants to begin armistice negotiations forthwith. With its military plans falling to pieces and facing total discredit, the United States was compelled to consent to the proposal, at least in word. In fact, however, it did its utmost to stretch out the war. When the main terms of the armistice were worked out, the US Government forcibly detained prisoners of war belonging to the Korean People's Army or the Chinese volunteers. To break the deadlock created by the imperialists, the Soviet delegation to the 7th General Assembly suggested in November 1952 to terminate hostilities at once on the basis of the already approved clauses of the agreement and to submit the question of POWs to a UN commission consisting of the United States, Britain, France, the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, India, Burma, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, the Korean People's Democratic Republic and South Korea. The People's Republic of China and the Korean People's Democratic Republic welcomed this proposal, which did not impair the prestige of either side and led to a rapid cessation of the war. But the United States took advantage of its voting machinery in the United Nations to squash the Soviet proposal.

In March-April 1953, the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the Korean People's Democratic Republic came forward with a new initiative, suggesting to adjust the POW problem in conformance with the

recommendations of India and a few other Asian countries. The Soviet Government said it was confident that these compromise proposals would not be misunderstood by the US Government.

The demarches of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries isolated the war architects and compelled the United States to resume the negotiations. On June 8, 1953, an agreement was concluded on the repatriation of POWs in accordance with a Sino-Korean proposal, and an armistice was signed on July 27. The Korean Armistice Agreement provided for a "complete cessation of hostilities and of all acts of armed force in Korea until a final peaceful settlement is achieved". A demarcation line and a demilitarised zone were drawn between the KPDR and South Korea in the proximity of the 38th parallel.

Together with other peace-loving states, the Soviet Union made considerable efforts to terminate the war in Indochina, which the French colonialists had been waging since 1946 against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the peoples of Laos and Cambodia.

US governing quarters supported France with an eye to turning Indochina into a staging area for aggression against the People's Republic of China and the independent countries of Southeast Asia. The US monopolies hoped to elbow out the French imperialists and to gain control over Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. US efforts to sustain the war in Indochina after the Korean armistice were therefore redoubled.

For all this, the French colonialists suffered one defeat after another. In early 1954, the People's Army of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam encircled and routed a large enemy force at Dien Bien Phu and the people of France became more insistent still in their demand to end the "dirty war".

In these circumstances, the Berlin Conference of the Foreign Ministers of the USSR, the USA, Britain and France upheld the Soviet proposal to discuss measures that would ease international tension. As a result of the ensuing exchanges, a decision was taken to put the Indochina question on the agenda of the Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers, scheduled for April 1954, to which a representative of the People's Republic of China was also invited.

The United States attempted to torpedo the conference by proposing to its allies to take joint military action in Indochina. However, the British and French governments refused even to discuss this proposal before the conclusion of the Geneva negotiations. Sentiment against the Indochinese war was running much too high all over the world. Yet the main obstacle to the imperialist compact was the firm stand of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, who urged negotiations to end the war.

The Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and South Vietnam joined the Indochina discussion of the five Great Powers in Geneva. Representatives of the Soviet Union and Britain chairmanned the conference. The Soviet delegation supported the peace plan put forward by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. This provided for an immediate cease-fire and a subsequent political settlement based on France's recognition of the independence of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, the unification of each of these states by means of free and general elections, and the withdrawal of French troops.

The socialist delegations rejected Western demands incompatible with the sovereignty of the Indochinese states. They made a number of compromise proposals that took into account the wishes of France and her allies. This tactics made it difficult for the imperialists to scuttle the negotiations, which the US diplomats, for one, were more than eager to do.

Also, the work of the socialist countries at the negotiations was helped by the stand of the neutralist Asian states, who came out strongly in favour of a peace settlement based on recognition of the independence of Indochina's peoples. Furthermore, the imperialists had to reckon with the peace sentiment reigning in their own countries. When French spokesmen in Geneva attempted to obstruct agreement, the National Assembly denied confidence to the cabinet for its Indochina policy and spoke out in favour of ending the "dirty war". The new French cabinet declared that it would work for a settlement acceptable to all concerned. The United States was thus isolated and unable to obstruct a cease-fire in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos.

A temporary demarcation line was drawn across Vietnam somewhat south of the 17th parallel. The armed forces of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam withdrew to the north of this line, while French troops and those of Emperor Bao-Dai's puppet government withdrew to the south of it. In Laos, the Pathet Lao forces were withdrawn to the two north-eastern provinces. Mixed commissions consisting of representatives of the combatants were set up for the three Indochina states and international commissions of Canadian, Indian and Polish delegates were formed to control the situation. The Indian diplomat was made chairman.

The Geneva Agreements prohibited foreign military bases in Indochina and banned the entry of any part of Vietnam, Laos or Cambodia into military blocs. France undertook to withdraw her troops from the three countries.

On July 21, 1954, the Geneva Conference approved a final declaration. The negotiators took cognisance with satisfaction of the armistice agreement and announced that free elections would be held in Laos and Cambodia in 1955 and in Vietnam in 1956 to form national governments and reunify temporarily partitioned Vietnam. The parties undertook to respect the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of the Indochinese states, to prevent interference in their domestic affairs and to consult each other in matters related to the fulfilment of the adopted decisions.

The cease-fire in Korea and Indochina was a big success for the peace-loving forces.

A graphic lesson was administered once more to the imperialists that they could no longer alter a social system by force of arms and restore to the capitalist fold countries that had parted from it. The Western powers were, in fact, compelled to accept the existence of the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, which they had unsuccessfully tried to destroy by armed force. This outcome testified to the invincible power of the world socialist system and to the unity and fraternal mutual assistance of the socialist countries. The role of the Soviet Union in combating imperialist aggression stood out once again in bold relief.

The defeat of the interventionists in Korea and Indo-

china was a major victory for the national liberation movement. It demonstrated convincingly that the colonialists could no longer plunder Asia with impunity. The victory of the peoples of Korea, Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia gave fresh impetus to the struggle for independence and neutralism in Asia and Africa.

The armistice agreements delivered a crushing blow to the imperialist policy "from positions of strength". Showing that acute international conflicts may be settled on mutually acceptable terms, they proved right the Soviet Union and the other countries that promoted the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

Termination of the State of War and Resumption of Diplomatic Relations Between the Soviet Union and Japan

After the Korean war ended, normalisation of Soviet-Japanese relations became urgently necessary for Far Eastern peace. Defying the objections of the Soviet Union and other peace-loving states, the United States and its allies concluded the San Francisco Treaty with Japan in 1951, paving the way for her remilitarisation. A Japanese-American security treaty was concluded at the same time, providing for the continued stay of US troops in Japanese territory and their participation in putting down "large-scale internal riots and disturbances". These terms were welcomed by the Japanese monopolists, selling military commodities to the United States, but contradicted the interests of the people, who were dead set against the revival of militarism and involvement in America's aggressive plans.

The San Francisco Treaty went against the national interest and security of the Soviet Union and People's China. It did not settle any of the important territorial issues. Besides, the United States would not let the People's Republic of China, the Mongolian People's Republic and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, whose populations had suffered most from Japanese aggression and had made an outstanding contribution to the victory over the Japanese militarists, to participate in the treaty.

For these reasons, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries that attended the San Francisco Conference, refused to sign the peace instrument. A state of war thus continued to exist juridically between them and Japan, which ruled out normal diplomatic and commercial relations. The United States could not have been more pleased. It pumped fabulous profits out of exports which Japan could have obtained on more advantageous terms in the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. Besides, it made the most of the international isolation of Japan to reinforce its own positions in that country.

The Soviet Government repeatedly suggested practical steps to restore diplomatic relations with Japan. The Soviet initiative finally gave a start to negotiations. They began in the summer of 1955, but were broken off several times due to US intrigues. Besides, some influential groups in Japan made the resumption of relations conditional on a revision of the already implemented decisions of the Crimean Conference (February 1945), under which South Sakhalin was returned and the Kurile Islands transferred to the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Government rejected these claims, while voicing its readiness to make some concessions for the sake of agreement. In September 1955, it suggested that the two sides first agree on ending the state of war and establishing diplomatic relations, which would facilitate solution of the other aspects of a peace treaty. While insisting on adherence to international agreements related to territorial issues, the Soviet Union expressed its readiness to deal favourably with Japan's wishes concerning the islands of Habomai and Shikotan if Japan, for her part, appreciated the Soviet position. Besides, the Soviet Government declared its readiness to increase trade with Japan to the 1,000-million ruble mark within five years. Japanese business quarters welcomed this.

The Japanese Government sent a delegation headed by Prime Minister Hatoyama to the Soviet Union. On October 19, 1956, the Moscow negotiations culminated in a joint declaration. It ended the state of war and provided for the resumption of Soviet-Japanese diplomatic relations. The two countries declared they would not interfere in each other's affairs, recognised each other's right to individual

and collective self-defence, and undertook to discuss commercial matters, to co-operate in protecting fishing grounds in the north-western Pacific and to continue negotiating a peace treaty.

This declaration relieved tension in the Far East and set the scene for a fuller normalisation between the Soviet Union and Japan. In 1957, the two countries signed their first long-term commercial treaty, which gave impetus to a certain expansion of trade. A bilateral fisheries commission was set up and is functioning with success.

The Soviet Government has always been sincerely eager to establish friendship and business co-operation with Japan and to resolve all disputed issues. It always insisted on the swift conclusion of a peace treaty and on joint efforts to consolidate peace in the Far East. Time and again, it appealed to Japan to follow a peace-loving policy and to prevent her territory from being turned into a staging area for a nuclear war. The Soviet Union proposed that it would guarantee Japan's neutrality unilaterally, or jointly with the United States, or through the United Nations.

Regrettably, Japanese ruling quarters have been evading a peace treaty and putting forward groundless territorial claims. Also, their military alliance with the United States has been jeopardising peace in the Far East and impeding the development of Soviet-Japanese relations.

In January 1960, a revised text of the US-Japanese Security Treaty was signed in Washington. It provides for further rearmament of Japan under US control and for Japanese armed participation in US military operations. The article which envisages joint action if in the opinion of one of the sides "the security of Japan or international peace and security of the Far East is threatened", is particularly dangerous. This formula makes it possible for the US to commandeer Japanese troops for an attack on the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China or the Korean People's Democratic Republic, and doubly so since, according to an official Japanese "explanation", the term "Far East" specifically covers China, Korea and part of the Soviet Pacific seaboard.

The new treaty has redoubled Japan's dependence on the United States. It has broadened her military commitments and, in effect, involved her in the system of US-

sponsored aggressive military alliances and blocs spear-headed against the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries.

When the Security Treaty was concluded, the Soviet Government was compelled to warn Japan that the line followed by the Japanese leaders contradicted the letter and spirit of the joint 1956 declaration. In view of the danger of aggression emanating from Japanese territory, the Soviet Union also notified Japan that it could no longer entertain the idea of turning over the islands of Habomai and Shikotan.

However, the Soviet Union worked on diligently to improve relations with Japan. In 1961, the Soviet Government proposed that the two countries expand mutually advantageous political, economic, scientific and cultural co-operation. A Soviet industrial exhibition was held in Tokyo to promote contacts, while a Japanese exhibition was held in Moscow. The exhibitions roused considerable public interest.

In 1964, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Japanese Parliament exchanged official delegations, and ensuing negotiations confirmed that both countries had a stake in good-neighbour relations. Soviet-Japanese trade continued to grow. Early in 1965, the two countries agreed to negotiate a consular convention and a direct airline, and also a visit of the Japanese Prime Minister to the USSR.

A final normalisation between the two countries is still being impeded by the absence of a peace treaty. Goaded by the US imperialists, certain quarters in Japan make the most of this fact to complicate relations with the Soviet Union. Yet the facts show, as emphasised in a joint statement of a CPSU delegation and the Socialist Party of Japan, that the development of peaceful coexistence and good-neighbour relations "are bound to create conditions for greater contacts between the two countries and pave the way for the conclusion of a peace treaty".¹

The Soviet Government continues to work with an open heart for closer co-operation and for the solution of pressing issues with Japan, whose people call insistently for neutralism, the withdrawal of foreign troops and for better relations with the USSR.

¹ *Pravda*, July 16, 1964.

Soviet Support of the Korean People's Effort to Reunify Their Country Peacefully

The 1953 armistice set the stage for the final solution of the Korean problem and the unification of the country in accordance with popular will. Yet this is being impeded by the provocative conduct of the imperialists. On the day the war ended the United States and its allies signed a declaration projecting "co-operation" if the war in Korea were to break out again. On October 1, 1953, Washington and the Syngman Rhee government concluded a treaty formalising the permanent stay of US troops in South Korea. Washington also scuttled the convocation of a political conference, provided for in the armistice agreement for the final settlement of the Korean question.

On Soviet insistence, the Korean question was discussed in April-July 1954 at the Geneva Conference of the Foreign Ministers of the USSR, CPR, Britain, France and the United States. The Korean People's Democratic Republic, South Korea and the allies of the United States in the Korean war took part in the discussion.

The socialist states proposed all-Korea elections under the supervision of an international commission (consisting of representatives of neutral states) after all foreign armed forces, including the Chinese volunteers, will have been withdrawn. Since the Western powers would not consent, the Soviet Union, the CPR and the Korean People's Democratic Republic made compromise proposals. As a result, the points of view of the countries concerned came considerably closer. But the imperialists declared categorically that the elections should be held under UN control (without the withdrawal of foreign troops) and refused to discuss the matter any further.

Every session of the UN General Assembly since 1954 (except the 19th) has examined the question of Korean unification, although the United Nations is formally one of the combatants. The Soviet delegation insisted that representatives of the Korean People's Democratic Republic participate in the discussions, because no solution would be valid without its consent. This proposal had the support of the socialist and of many neutralist states. But under

US pressure the General Assembly confined itself to inviting only South Korea.

The United States and its allies have had the resolution on the "unification of Korea" through UN-supervised elections in the presence of US occupation troops confirmed annually. This resolution will not help to solve the Korean problem, because, as the Soviet spokesmen point out, it endorses "previous erroneous decisions whose incompetence has been proved by the facts". It is utter folly to try to abolish the Korean People's Democratic Republic by means of the United Nations voting machine after the United States and other imperialist countries have failed to do so by armed force in a three-year war. While delaying the country's unification, the United States is defying the terms of the armistice and increasing the size of the South Korean army, shipping in armaments, including rockets and nuclear missiles, and encouraging Seoul's call for a resumption of the "northward campaign".

The Korean People's Democratic Republic, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries oppose the imperialist policy of perpetuating the partition and turning South Korea into a dangerous seat of aggression with a purposeful programme of adjustment in accordance with the interests of the Korean people and Far Eastern peace. This programme is focussed on Korea's unification by Koreans without foreign interference. In pursuance of this goal, the Korean People's Democratic Republic has offered Seoul to develop economic, commercial and cultural contacts and to negotiate all-Korea democratic elections and the withdrawal of foreign troops.

The detachments of Chinese volunteers left Korea in 1958. When they did so, the KPDR, USSR and CPR again urged the United States to withdraw its troops from South Korea. But the US Government refused out of hand, although it had priorly declared that it was keeping its armed forces in Korea merely as a "counterweight" to the Chinese volunteer force.

The call for peaceful and democratic reunification enjoys mass support in South Korea, whose population overthrew the pro-American Syngman Rhee clique in the spring of 1960. Though the United States succeeded in putting other of its agents in power, the 1960 events spoke of the peo-

ple's profound discontent with the US occupation and the country's partition.

Responding to the wishes of the people, the Government of the Korean People's Democratic Republic again called on the South Korean authorities in November 1960 to unify the country by means of all-Korea elections. It suggested as a transitional measure to form a confederation of the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the Republic of Korea (South Korea). Either was to retain its independence, and a Supreme National Committee was to take charge of the confederation's affairs. A favourable climate would thus have been created to replace the armistice with a dependable peace and to achieve the country's unification. Moreover, the confederation would not prejudice the systems existing in the two parts of Korea. It would be the simplest way for the Korean people to settle their future.

The Soviet Government welcomed the proposal of the Korean People's Democratic Republic. "In view of the existence of two states with different social systems," it said, "the country's reunification cannot be achieved by imposing the will of one state on the other and, all the more, by attempting to join one part of the country to the other by force."

In 1962, the Supreme People's Assembly of the KPDR called on South Korea to conclude a non-aggression treaty and reach an understanding on arms reduction, and then work jointly for the withdrawal of US troops. Later, the KPDR repeatedly put forward concrete offers for improving relations and negotiating Korean affairs without foreign interference. But the United States and the Seoul rulers turned a deaf ear to all these proposals.

US imperialism transformed South Korea into an American colony and military base. It obstructed the country's peaceful unification, engineered continuous provocations against the KPDR and bludgeoned Japan into negotiating greater military contacts with South Korea. The ultimate purpose of the Washington policy-makers was to form a new aggressive bloc that would include the Chiang Kai-shek clique.

In the circumstances, it was important to reinforce the security of the socialist countries in the Far East. On July 6, 1961, the Soviet Union and the KPDR concluded a Treaty

of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance. It contained the provision that either side shall offer the other all forms of assistance, not short of armed assistance, in the event of an attack. A similar treaty was concluded by the KPDR and the People's Republic of China in July 1961.

In February 1965, a Soviet Government delegation visited the Korean People's Democratic Republic. Once again, the Soviet Union declared its full support of the struggle "for the peaceful unification of Korea by the Korean people itself after US troops are withdrawn from South Korea, without any foreign interference whatsoever, along democratic lines" and welcomed the concrete proposals of the KPDR on this score.

In 1965, an agreement was signed on the so-called normalisation of relations between Japan and South Korea. This was done under US pressure. Japan's undertaking to support the anti-popular Seoul clique has deepened the split in Korea. The Soviet Union joined the KPDR Government in condemning the deal between the Japanese rulers and the South Korean authorities and called on Japan to nullify the agreement which goes against the interests of the Japanese and Korean peoples and imperils peace in the Far East.

Soviet Union and CPR Efforts to Reclaim Taiwan

Restoration of Taiwan, an inseparable part of China, to the People's Republic of China is one of the cardinal conditions for relieving international tension in the Far East. Having seized Taiwan in 1950, the United States has rearmed Chiang Kai-shek's bands there and uses them for armed provocations against China.

In 1954, the United States concluded a military alliance with the Kuomintang. Soon after, US Congress authorised the President to employ armed force to "ensure the security" of Formosa (Taiwan) and the Pescadores (Penghulitao) without preliminary Congress sanction. Virtually, it gave him the right to start a war together with the Chiang Kai-shek clique against the people of China. At the same time, the US Government went out of its way to induce the People's Republic of China to accept the idea of "two

Chinas" or, in effect, to consent to the seizure of Taiwan by the United States.

In 1955, the CPR Government suggested negotiations with the United States to settle the Taiwan problem. It stressed that it did not recognise the theory of "two Chinas" and considered the liberation of Taiwan an internal affair of the Chinese people, who preferred to achieve it by peaceful means but would, if necessary, employ armed force. The Chinese Government said that since US interference was the sole reason behind the international tension over Taiwan, it was essential for US troops to withdraw from that island.

The initiative of the People's Republic of China led to negotiations. They opened in Geneva in 1955. After failing to prevail on the CPR to abandon her sovereign rights to Taiwan, the United States torpedoed the talks. Immediately, Kuomintang gangs engineered fresh military provocations at Quemoy and Mantsue. In September 1958, the US Government publicly declared that it supported the armed actions of the Kuomintang. It thereby hoped to compel the People's Republic of China to recognise US control over Taiwan. Yet its aggressive plans foundered.

The people of China began building up a volunteer force to repulse the imperialists. They had the wholehearted support of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. The Soviet-Chinese communique of August 3, 1958, said that any attempted aggression would be resisted jointly. The Soviet warning on September 7 that an attack on the People's Republic of China, an ally of the Soviet Union, would be viewed as an attack on the USSR, had strong impact in the prevailing circumstances. The US ruling quarters abandoned their attempt to start an armed conflict. They accepted China's proposal to resume negotiations, and this duly occurred in September 1958 in Warsaw.

All these years, the Warsaw negotiations have made no progress, because the United States continues to insist on the legalisation of Taiwan's secession. In the meantime, it is helping Chiang Kai-shek to build up his armed forces.

Soviet Relations with Southeast Asian States

Efforts to restore peace in the Far East and Indochina have tended to strengthen friendly relations between the Soviet Union and the peace-loving Asian countries. In April 1954, the People's Republic of China and India proclaimed the well-known five principles (Pancha-Shila) governing relations between states: mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual advantage, and peaceful coexistence.

Having always acted on these principles, the Soviet Union put the full weight of its support behind them. In statements made jointly with India, Burma, Indonesia and many other countries, the Soviet Government reiterated its readiness to follow these principles.

The Soviet attitude furthered their recognition by most of the Asian and African countries and, in one form or another, by many European and American capitalist states. The Pancha-Shila principles have become a standard of international law. Governments which formally repugn the peaceful coexistence policy are compelled to reckon with it all the same. Co-operation of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries with Asian and African states on the basis of these principles has become an important factor in safeguarding peace and the independence of the peoples of those continents.

India, Indonesia, Burma and Ceylon, which have espoused peaceful coexistence, refused to enter the aggressive SEATO, formed by the imperialists in 1954 of the United States, Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Pakistan and Thailand. A sector in the military encirclement of the socialist countries, SEATO is meant also to reinforce colonialism and to suppress liberation movements. It imperils the independence of the neutralist countries and furthers the enslavement of the Asian states involved in it.

The stand of the peace-loving Asian countries won the understanding and support of the Soviet Union. In a statement on September 15, 1954, the Foreign Ministry of the USSR showed convincingly that the US-sponsored SEATO is deeply inimical to the interests of the Asian

peoples and aimed against security in Asia and the Far East.

The Soviet Government, which favours the unification of anti-imperialist forces, acclaimed the first conference of 29 Asian and African countries in Bandung, held April 18-24, 1955.¹ The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Presidiums of the Supreme Soviets of the Uzbek, Tajik, Turkmen, Kazakh and Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republics sent messages of greeting to the Conference.

The friendly concern and help of the Soviet Union, a great socialist power, facilitated the struggle which the People's Republic of China, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, India, Indonesia, Egypt and other peace-loving countries waged at the Conference against the intrigues of imperialist agents. A unanimous decision was adopted to invigorate the solidarity of the Afro-Asian countries in the struggle against colonialism. The Conference took its stand in favour of universal disarmament, the prohibition of nuclear weapons, and the development of international relations on a basis of equality and co-operation. It emphasised the necessity for the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

The Soviet Union welcomed the decisions of the Bandung Conference and thereby furthered the development of Afro-Asian co-operation on a peaceful anti-imperialist basis.

The Soviet Union maintains close, friendly relations with most of the Southeast Asian countries.

A Soviet-Indian trade agreement was concluded in December 1953. India was afforded the opportunity of buying Soviet manufactured goods, while the Soviet Union could purchase Indian farm products and raw materials. Direct shipping lines were established on a reciprocal basis between ports of the two countries. Unlike the Western powers, the Soviet Union does not object to goods being transported in Indian bottoms.

¹ The Conference was attended by Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Egypt, Ethiopia, the Gold Coast, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Laos, the Lebanon, Liberia, Lybia, Nepal, Pakistan, the People's Republic of China, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, South Vietnam, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Turkey and Yemen.

On February 2, 1955, an agreement was concluded on the building of the Bhilai iron and steel project, designed to produce one million tons of steel annually. The Soviet Union granted credits of 500 million (old) rubles for this purpose. On February 3, 1959, the mill produced its first pig iron, and was in full operation by the end of the year. An agreement was then reached to boost its capacity to 2,500,000 tons of steel a year.

Soviet and Rumanian specialists helped India to prospect for oil and to build oil refineries. This disproved the contentions of capitalist firms that no oil deposits of any worth existed in the country. In 1957 and 1960, the Soviet Union granted India new credits of over 2,500 million (old) rubles to build an engineering plant and other industrial projects.

India had negotiated with the United States for some years the building of a state-operated iron and steel plant. After many delays, the US Government refused credit despite repeated promises. But the US effort to frustrate the country's economic development proved futile. In January 1965, the Soviet Union concluded an agreement with India in which it undertook to assist in the building of a steel mill in Bokaro with a capacity of 1.5-2 million tons of steel annually and a subsequent boost to four million tons. The people of India hold the financial and technical assistance of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in high esteem. They regard it as an important factor in their country's independent development.

In 1956 and 1960, the Soviet Union concluded general agreements with the Republic of Indonesia on economic and technical co-operation. These provided for aid in building industrial projects and for credits to cover the cost of equipment and services. The Soviet Union is also rendering economic, scientific and technical aid to Burma, Ceylon, Cambodia, Nepal and Laos.

The Soviet Government has always favoured good-neighbour relations with Pakistan on the basis of peaceful co-existence. Under a trade agreement concluded in 1956, the USSR supplied Pakistan with industrial equipment, machine tools, farming machinery, metal, oil, etc., in exchange for jute, wool, cotton, tea and other commodities. In 1961, the Soviet Union agreed to help organise oil prospecting in the

country and granted appropriate credits. All the same, for a number of years relations with Pakistan did not develop as extensively as with most of the other Southeast Asian countries. Being a member of SEATO and CENTO, Pakistan supported the policies of the US imperialists and made its territory available for airfields and missile pads which imperilled the security of the Soviet Union and other countries.

More recently, however, tendencies towards an independent line have appeared in Pakistan's policy. This change shows that the aspirations of a freedom-loving nation cannot go hand in hand with support of aggressive Western actions. The new trend has furthered business contacts with the socialist countries, which President Ayub Khan confirmed during his visit to the USSR in April 1965.

In a joint communique, the Soviet and Pakistan governments condemned colonialism and imperialism, spoke out for universal disarmament and the solution of international issues by peaceful means, and listed the existing opportunities for developing good-neighbour relations. These principles were cemented by the conclusion of a trade agreement and a protocol on Soviet deliveries of machinery and equipment in 1965-67.

Soviet co-operation with the Southeast Asian countries has the effect of strengthening peace and the independence of the peoples of that area, and promotes the swift and full extirpation of the remnants of colonialism. True to its Leninist policy of struggle against colonialism, the USSR supported the demand for the liberation of Goa, Daman and Diu, Indian territories captured by Portugal. In 1955, US State Secretary John Foster Dulles recognised Portugal's "possessions" in Asia as her "overseas provinces", subject to defence within the framework of the North Atlantic Alliance. His attempt to compel India "to respect the right" of the occupying country failed thanks to the Soviet stand. The Soviet Government delegation then visiting India firmly condemned the dodge of US diplomacy and expressed confidence that the Goa question "will be resolved in favour of the Indian people, whether the colonialists like it or not". In a joint communique issued six years later concerning Prime Minister Nehru's negotiations in Moscow, the Soviet Government again expressed its profound under-

standing of, and sympathy for, the "wish of the Indian people to achieve the immediate liberation of Goa, Daman and Diu from Portuguese colonialism".

The friendly support of the great socialist power had a far-reaching effect. In December 1961, Indian troops drove out the occupation army, demolishing one more imperialist stronghold in Indian territory.

The firm stand of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries during the discussion in the Security Council in December 1961 of the "complaint" of the Portuguese colonialists prevented the Western powers from passing a resolution accusing the Indian republic of aggression.

The Soviet Union supported the liberation struggle of the Indonesian people in every way. In 1945-49, when the Indonesians fought for their independence, the Soviet Government exposed the aggression of the Dutch imperialists and their henchmen. Soviet diplomats initiated a discussion of the matter in the United Nations. Soviet actions and those of other peace-loving countries expedited the recognition of Indonesia's sovereignty and the withdrawal of Dutch troops from her territory. The USSR established friendly relations with the young state and backed all its efforts to consolidate independence and repeal unequal agreements saddled upon it by the Netherlands with US help.

In 1957, the Indonesian Government assumed control over the property of Dutch monopolies. In reply, the colonial powers organised an armed rebellion in Sumatra and Sulawesi. The imperialists plied the rebels with arms and held SEATO naval manoeuvres near Indonesian shores. A threat of foreign intervention loomed big.

The Soviet Government came out firmly in defence of Indonesia. In a statement of May 14, 1958, it warned the Western powers that they would be held responsible for the consequences. This timely support relieved the threat of an invasion and made it easier for the Indonesian army and people to crush the rebellion.

Yet the security and territorial integrity of Indonesia were not yet fully achieved. The Dutch colonialists were still in possession of West Irian (part of the island of New Guinea) which is traditionally Indonesian territory. In 1958, the Indonesian Government complained to the United

Nations about the Netherlands refusing to negotiate the return of West Irian. The Soviet delegation was instrumental in the matter being put on the agenda of the General Assembly and insisted that the Netherlands negotiate the peaceful return of West Irian.

In a joint statement on February 28, 1960, the Soviet Union and Indonesia again declared their design to see all traces of colonialism weeded out. The Soviet Government gave full support to the Indonesian demands in relation to West Irian.

Relying on the backing of the Western powers, Holland ignored the demands of the Indonesian people and reinforced her army in West Irian. Dutch war preparations added strain to the situation. The threat to Indonesia's national unity and security was made more acute by the assistance which the Dutch colonialists received from SEATO. The Indonesian Government was compelled to ask the USSR to sell it armaments. The Soviet Government responded promptly. In January 1961, the two countries signed an appropriate agreement.¹

Indonesia made every effort to settle the issue with Holland by negotiation. But in face of the provocative military preparations made by the colonialists, it had to decide late in 1961 on liberating West Irian by force. When advanced detachments of the Indonesian army attacked several Dutch garrisons with the support of the population, Holland agreed to conclude an agreement. This was on August 15, 1962. On May 1, 1963, control over West Irian was transferred to Indonesia.

Geneva Conference on Laos

As one of the chairmen of the 1954 Geneva Conference, the Soviet Union has in every way furthered the precise fulfilment of the armistice and the political adjustments in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. Yet its peace efforts encountered dogged Western resistance. The Western powers interfered in the affairs of the Indochina states and sought to convert their territories into a SEATO staging post. They

¹ See *Pravda*, Jan. 8, 1961.

exploited Britain, whose representative had been the co-chairman of the Geneva Conference, to obstruct the establishment of an enduring peace in Indochina.

Despite imperialist intrigues, the people of Cambodia, who were backed by the Soviet Union, the other socialist countries, and the neutralist states, have developed their land as a peace-loving state. In 1957, Cambodia's National Assembly passed a law on permanent neutrality, which ruled out involvement in any military or political alignment. The Cambodian Government pursues an independent policy and maintains friendly relations with all countries. In March 1959, when the imperialists stepped up their attacks on Cambodia, the Soviet Union issued public assurances that it appreciated Cambodia's position and condemned the SEATO subversions.

Bent on pushing Cambodia off her neutralist course, the US militarists initiated armed provocations against that country from the territory of South Vietnam. In 1963 alone, the aggressors violated the ground, sea and air frontiers of the country 209 times. In March 1964, South Vietnamese troops and planes master-minded by US advisers bombarded a Cambodian village. The Soviet Government protested strongly and gave full backing to Cambodia's proposal that an international conference guarantee her neutrality. When the Cambodian complaint was examined in the Security Council in May 1964, the Soviet delegate demanded that the body condemn the United States and take appropriate measures to safeguard Cambodia's independence and territorial integrity. Backed by the peace-loving states, the Cambodian Government was able to repulse the interventionists. In May 1965, it broke off diplomatic relations with Washington.

For a long time, the United States and its allies obstructed the unification of Laos, provided for by the Geneva agreements. When Souvanna Phouma's government, which came to power in 1960 despite enemy intrigues and provocations, declared its neutrality, the United States sponsored an armed rebellion of reactionary Rightist groups. Government troops and Pathet Lao forces defeated the rebels. This made the US Government agree to an armistice and to international talks on Laos.

A 14-nation conference¹ convened in Geneva on May 16, 1961, and lasted until July 23, 1962 (with several interruptions). From the beginning, the Soviet delegation proposed that the conference issue a declaration on the neutrality of Laos and the withdrawal of foreign troops from Laotian territory. The merits of the Soviet proposal were so patently obvious that the United States had had to consent. But its consent was no more than verbal. The US spokesmen demanded that foreign observers be appointed to supervise the fulfilment of the Laos agreements. The rebel clique, which was closely connected with the United States, obstructed the formation of a coalition government under Souvanna Phouma, although the various Laotian leaders had agreed on it in June 1961.

From diplomatic bickering the United States went on to the use of arms. Defying the armistice, the rebels reopened hostilities in the summer of 1962, only to suffer another defeat. Not until then did they consent to a coalition government.

On July 9, 1962, the new government declared that it would honour the five principles of peaceful coexistence and build a "peaceful, neutral, independent, democratic, unified and prosperous Laos". This declaration became part of the Declaration on the Neutrality of Laos, based on the main points of the Soviet draft and approved by the Geneva Conference.

The Declaration obliges all states to respect and observe "the sovereignty, independence, neutrality, unity and territorial integrity of the Kingdom of Laos", to refrain from interfering in its internal affairs and from involving it in any military agreements. It also required the withdrawal of foreign troops and other personnel. Control over the agreements was assigned to an international commission consisting of Polish, Indian and Canadian representatives, who would co-ordinate their activities with the Laotian Government and avoid interfering in domestic affairs.²

The Laos agreement was a diplomatic triumph for the

¹ Britain, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, France, India, Laos, the People's Republic of China, Poland, South Vietnam, the Soviet Union, Thailand and the United States.

² See *Izvestia*, July 31, 1962.

socialist and neutralist states. For the first time, international guarantees of neutralism were furnished in the form of an agreement with the participation of the Western powers.

During the visit to the Soviet Union in February 1963 of Sri Savang Vathana, the King of Laos, and Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma, the Soviet and Laotian governments reaffirmed their determination to observe the Geneva Agreements of 1962. The Laotian statesmen expressed their gratitude to the Soviet Union for its economic and technical aid.

However, the Geneva decisions were again obstructed by the United States. The United States made use of the Rightist alignment of former rebels, whom it continued to ply with arms. In April 1963, Kinim Folsena, the Laotian Foreign Minister, was assassinated and terrorist acts were committed against other neutralist and Pathet Lao ministers. The State Department gave undisguised support to the provocateurs by declaring its readiness to send arms and troops to Laos. The manoeuvres of the United States and its agents paralysed the coalition government and led to what was actually a resumption of the civil war.

The Soviet Union insisted on a stop to the intervention and on the implementation of the Geneva Agreements. During Souvanna Phouma's visit to Moscow at the close of 1963, the Soviet Government expressed its hope that negotiations between the various Laotian groups would facilitate the normal functioning of the coalition government. The Soviet Union welcomed the Cambodian proposal of convening a conference of the 14 signatories to the 1962 Geneva Agreements, and the Polish proposal of consultations between the Soviet Union, Britain, the member-countries of the international commission and the Laotian leaders.

The efforts of the peace-loving countries are still being resisted by the US ruling quarters, whose aggressive conduct is abetted by Britain, the co-chairman of the Geneva Conference. The United States is still working for a pro-imperialist Laotian government and the dismissal of the neutral leaders. Besides, it is provoking clashes between the neutralists and the Pathet Lao. US planes take part in military operations against the patriotic forces.

Soviet Action to Combat the US Aggression in Vietnam

The conduct of the US imperialists in Vietnam gradually developed into an outright threat to peace. When the Indochina armistice was concluded, the United States elbowed out the French colonialists and established its own control over the southern part of Vietnam. Through the Ngo Dinh Diem clique, which it had put in power, the United States obstructed the reunification of Vietnam by democratic elections provided for in the Geneva Agreements. Besides, it scorned the ban on stationing military personnel and arms, and the involvement of any part of Vietnam in military alliances. US "military advisers" were sent to South Vietnam, their number quickly growing to several thousand men. Large quantities of arms were shipped in. South Vietnam participated in SEATO military conferences and war games.

The abuses of the puppets and their patrons angered the South Vietnamese patriots. The workers and peasants of South Vietnam began a struggle against the US interventionists, a struggle for independence and the right to settle the question of Vietnam's reunification by themselves in accordance with the Geneva Agreements. This struggle developed swiftly into an armed conflict. Scattered groups merged into an army of liberation. By 1965, under the leadership of the National Liberation Front organised in 1960 nearly three-fourths of the territory, inhabited by two-thirds of the population of South Vietnam, was cleared of the enemy. The failure of the intervention was betokened by the corruption of the puppet regime imposed on the South Vietnamese population by the United States. On November 1, 1963, a military coup deposed Ngo Dinh Diem, and a new group of US puppets was put in power. Eight governments succeeded each other in Saigon in a matter of 20 months. Yet the imperialists failed to "stabilise" the anti-popular regime. To retain control over South Vietnam, the United States then launched an undisguised aggression.

To justify their intervention, the US imperialists complained about "outside interference" to which the South Vietnamese patriots ostensibly owed their military

successes. Aggressive US actions were taken against Laos, Cambodia and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. After months and months of violating their air space and territorial waters, US planes began bombing villages in the Democratic Republic of Vietnam on August 5, 1964.

Defying the indignant protests of world opinion, US Congress passed a special resolution, hypocritically professing to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia. It gave the President special powers "to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force", that is, to wage an undeclared war.

From February 7, 1965, onward, the United States mounted almost daily piratic air raids on the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. At the same time, the US military command expanded its operations against the National Liberation Front, employing barbaric means of warfare, such as napalm and poison gases.

The ruling quarters of the United States expected to frighten the Vietnamese people into submission, to force the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam to abandon its struggle, and to shore up the positions of the reactionary forces in the rest of Southeast Asia. They also hoped that the threat of escalation would isolate the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the South Vietnamese patriots from the international forces of peace, primarily the Soviet Union.

But the people of Vietnam did not surrender. The South Vietnam partisans responded with powerful blows against the puppet troops and US garrisons. The Democratic Republic of Vietnam, too, showed extraordinary devotion and valour in face of the piratic US air raids.

In April 1965, the DRV National Assembly reaffirmed the Republic's determination to resist the aggression, build up its military potential and enhance the combat capacity of the army and population. The Central Committee of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam declared its resolve to continue the struggle for an independent, democratic, peaceful and neutral South Vietnam with the object of reunifying the country and warned that if the United States expanded the war it would appeal to all nations to send volunteers. The socialist countries, many of the neutralist states, and world opinion in general, demanded that

the Americans cease their aggression in Vietnam. Even some of America's NATO allies, France among them, refused to support the US adventure and insisted on a peaceful settlement of the conflict.

The Soviet Union, for its part, did a lot to expose and contain the aggressor. At all times, it worked together with other peace-loving states to enforce the terms of the Geneva Agreements. Time and again, the Soviet Government suggested that the co-chairmen of the Geneva Conference—the USSR and Britain—ask the United States to stop its intervention in Vietnam. Britain rejected the idea of this diplomatic *démarche*, thus encouraging the aggressive US plan. On August 6 and September 22, 1964, the Soviet Government demanded that the dangerous armed provocations against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the responsibility for which falls squarely on the United States, be ceased forthwith.

The visit of a Soviet Government delegation headed by Alexei Kosygin to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam early in 1965 invigorated the international position of the DRV and the patriotic forces of Vietnam.¹ In February 1965, the Soviet Government reaffirmed that it would not "remain an indifferent bystander in the matter of safeguarding the security of a fraternal socialist country" and that it "completely supports the just and heroic struggle of the population of South Vietnam for independence, democracy, peace and neutrality".

Seventeen non-aligned countries demanded a stop to the aggression in an appeal to the United States on April 1, 1965, to settle the conflict by negotiation.

The US imperialists were faced by a broad front of peace-loving forces. Besides, they had to reckon with protests of their own people. On April 7, President Johnson was compelled to say he was ready to negotiate a peace settlement in Vietnam, provided there were no preliminary conditions. However, this was a smokescreen. In fact, the United States was bent on expanding its aggression. The American imperialists devised the doctrine of war escalation in Vietnam. This doctrine envisaged a gradual expansion of hostilities, not short of the use of nuclear weapons.

¹ See Chapter II.

The climb up the rungs of the military ladder is a hopeless attempt to enslave the freedom-loving people of Vietnam in reckless disregard of the threat of a world war.

Gradually, the United States stepped up its air raids on the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. Ships of the US 7th Fleet were deployed in Vietnam waters. The US Government officially sanctioned the participation of US troops in operations against the South Vietnamese patriots. On July 28, 1965, President Johnson announced that the US expeditionary force would be boosted from 75,000 to 125,000 men and admitted publicly that the United States was waging a hot war in Vietnam.

The American aggression is threatening international peace. The peril is growing by the hour. Frustrating this aggression is the most pressing task of the peace-loving forces. In July 1965, the World Congress for Peace, National Independence and General Disarmament, held in Helsinki, emphasised in its resolution on Vietnam that it is "the sacred and pressing duty of all peace champions to co-ordinate their actions in order to work effectively for the cessation of the aggressive war waged by the United States in Vietnam and thus eliminate the most dangerous seat of war in the world today".

The Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are working together against the imperialist aggressor, for the restoration of peace and order. In April 1965, a Party and Government delegation of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam visited the USSR. The two sides declared that they considered the National Liberation Front the true spokesman of the people of South Vietnam and supported its demands. The Soviet Union reasserted its fraternal solidarity with the people of Vietnam, fighting a just war of liberation, and pointed out that if the Government of the DRV asked for volunteers it would allow Soviet citizens wishing "to fight for the just cause of the Vietnamese people and the maintenance of the socialist gains of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam" to go to Vietnam.¹ The Soviet Union is helping the Democratic Republic of Vietnam to build up its defences. The aggressors are getting to know how effective this help can be.

¹ *Pravda*, Apr. 18, 1965.

The understanding reached between the Soviet Committee of Afro-Asian Solidarity and the Central Committee of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam on the establishment of a permanent mission of the Liberation Front in Moscow was an important measure in support of the South Vietnamese patriots.

Soviet efforts are concentrated on unifying all the peace-loving countries in the struggle against the imperialist aggression in Vietnam. In a communique concerning negotiations held in 1965 by a number of socialist and neutralist states, the governments of the Soviet Union and the countries concerned expressed grave apprehensions over the further deterioration of the situation in Vietnam, and denounced the aggression against the Vietnamese people and imperialist interference in Vietnamese affairs. They demanded that a Vietnam settlement be "found within the framework of the 1954 Geneva Agreements on Indochina, based on the principle of the self-determination of the Vietnamese people in conformance with its lawful right to freedom, independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity".

On August 2, 1965, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam once more denounced the American policy of escalation and declared the firm determination of its people to resist the US aggressor and his Saigon puppets until complete victory was won in the name of the freedom and independence of Vietnam. The Soviet Union supported this statement and pointed out on August 7 that it regarded the new US measures as outright acts of aggression. It warned that US statesmen should not indulge in the illusion that the American aggression will go unpunished. It will encounter ever increasing resistance and ultimately suffer ignominious defeat. The just cause of the Vietnamese people is certain to triumph.

Struggle Against Neo-Colonialist Designs in Southeast Asia

The imperialists are making extensive use of neo-colonialist methods in their subversive activities against the independence of Asian countries. On September 16, 1963, the

British imperialists sponsored the inauguration of Malaysia, a state consisting of Malaya, Singapore and the British colonies of Sarawak and North Borneo on the Indonesian island of Kalimantan. Britain's unequal agreements with Malaya, under which the colonialists bore responsibility for its "defence" and were allowed to keep war bases and troops in her territory, were spread to the new state. The main purpose of the newly formed federation was to preserve the British colonies on Kalimantan, whose population wishes reunification with Indonesia, and to create a military staging area against socialist and neutralist states. The founding of Malaysia, which was an undisguised provocation, added strain to the situation in Southeast Asia.

Eager to strengthen their influence in the independent Southeast Asian countries, the Western powers no longer insist on their involvement in military blocs. They announce their readiness to suffer neutralist policy and to increase financial aid. This new tactics is prompted by the fact that they can no longer bend the Asian countries to their will and have to reckon with the assistance which the socialist states are giving the newly free peoples. Although this constitutes a retreat, it is at once a great danger, being aimed at splitting the anti-imperialist forces and inducing the upper crust of the local bourgeoisie by means of modest handouts to line up with the monopolists. Thus, it pursues the old goals—the subjection of independent states to Western diktat.

The imperialist powers made the most of the Sino-Indian border differences, the premises for which date to the remote past when Britain repatterned the map of Asia at will. In 1914, it established the eastern border between India and China along the so-called MacMahon line. China did not recognise this unilateral act. Although the Sino-Indian border has never been demarcated and the two countries each had its own interpretation of it, there had been no conflicts over it between India and China for many years. When the first armed incidents occurred on the border in 1959, the Soviet Government expressed deep concern and regret. A TASS statement of September 10, 1959, voiced the hope that the People's Republic of China and India would not allow inimical forces interested in aggravating the international situation to capitalise on the border

clashes and would hasten to adjust their misunderstandings in accordance with their mutual interests and traditional friendship.

However, in October 1962, when the crisis in the Caribbean region was at its height, the border conflict broke out afresh with added force. Many people lost their lives in armed clashes. Sino-Indian relations grew bitter. The Western powers lost no time in exploiting the situation. The United States and Britain speedily shipped arms to India. Although the hostilities had ceased, they came out with the idea of "shielding" India with NATO air forces. Indian reactionaries gained heart.

The imperialists and their retinue are still eager to undermine the trust of the newly independent states in the socialist countries, to involve India in military blocs and to strengthen the local counter-revolutionary forces.

The conflict did untold damage to the national liberation movement, the progressives of India and the whole anti-imperialist front. All peace-loving forces had a vested interest in that the Sino-Indian border issue, like all other territorial disputes, be settled by peaceful means.

The Soviet Union's friendly co-operation with the Southeast Asian states is making good headway. It is a most important guarantee of peace and helps to safeguard the independence of the countries of that region against the designs of old and new colonialists.

SOVIET UNION COMBATS IMPERIALIST AGGRESSION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Soviet Proposals for the Peaceful Solution of Middle East Problems

Maintenance of peace in the Middle East became a focal problem in the mid-fifties. The anti-imperialist movement of the Arab peoples had made major progress by that time. A republic was proclaimed in Egypt (1953) after the overthrow of King Farouk's pro-British government. The National Government, leadership over which was soon assumed by Gamal Abdel Nasser, obtained Britain's promise to withdraw English troops from the Suez Canal Zone,

where they had been stationed since 1881. In Syria, a government that embarked on a progressive independent policy came to power in 1954 after armed manifestations by the military supported by the people.

The Western powers viewed the Middle East as a key strategic area near the frontiers of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. In 1952, they managed to involve Turkey in the North Atlantic bloc and to plant NATO bases in her territory. The United States also had an air base in Saudi Arabia and concluded an agreement on supplying Iran with arms. Britain had military aid treaties with Iraq and Jordan. The Western monopolies derived immense profits from the oil riches of the Middle East, whose prospected deposits amounted to more than 60 per cent of the capitalist world's total oil resources.

The imperialists feared that the consolidation of Arab national independence would impede their aggressive plans and end the undivided reign of their oil monopolies. They were eager, therefore, to crush the liberation movement, to restore the pro-imperialist feudal compradore governments and, through them, to bend the Middle East countries entirely to their own will.

Just as in Southeast Asia, the Western powers expected to achieve their goals by creating a military bloc. Britain assumed the initiative. In 1955, assisted by the anti-popular government of Nuri Said (Iraq), it engineered the so-called Baghdad Pact, forming a politico-military alliance between Iraq, Turkey, Britain, Pakistan and Iran. The United States did not enter the bloc for two reasons: it had contradictions with Britain, on the one hand, and feared a conflict with most of the Arab countries, on the other. But behind the scenes American diplomats helped to found the Baghdad alignment and later collaborated with many of its organs, particularly the Military Commission.

To entice the Arab states into the Baghdad line-up, Britain and the United States exerted strong pressure on Syria. She was faced by the threat of a military attack by Turkey and Israel. Yet Syria withstood the pressure. The Soviet warning that if the provocation continued, the USSR would initiate a discussion of imperialist interference in Syrian affairs in the United Nations helped considerably.

In 1955-56, the Middle East Arab states, with the

exception of Iraq, concluded an agreement on joint action and military assistance in the event of an aggression. To strengthen its defences, the Egyptian Government signed an agreement with Czechoslovakia in September 1955, bartering cotton and other farm products for armaments. The United States tried to obstruct Egypt's effort to reinforce her security. It threatened repressive action and required the annulment of the agreement. But Egypt stood firm. In upholding her sovereignty, she leaned for support on the Soviet Government, which declared that it saw eye to eye with the Egyptians about the right of every state to freely purchase weapons necessary for defence, to which no third country had grounds to object.

Since the Western powers were poised to use armed force in suppressing the independence of the Arab states, the Soviet Union issued a statement on April 16, 1955, on security in the Middle East and called for a settlement based on the principles of peaceful coexistence. It warned that if the policy of pressure and intimidation did not cease, it would take action to protect the independence of the states of that region.

In the UN Security Council, which discussed border clashes between Israel and the Arab countries, the Soviet representative exposed imperialist attempts to take advantage of the conflict for a military intervention. In talks with Britain and France in April-May 1956, the Soviet Government obtained assurances that the two countries would work for a peaceful solution of the controversies in the Middle East. But the Western powers broke their promise.

Soviet Union Acts to Relieve Suez Crisis

British troops were evacuated from Egyptian territory in June 1956. Dreading Egypt's independence, which had a far-reaching impact on the rest of the Arab East, the United States and Britain decided to put the country on its knees by economic pressures. They refused it loans promised earlier for a high dam project on the Nile. Replying to this hostile act, Egypt nationalised the Suez Canal Company owned by British and French capital. For decades, the company had been one of the principal imperialist economic

and political tools in Egypt. Its nationalisation would channel profits from the canal into the Republic's economy. The Egyptian Government's decision was politically and legally lawful. It announced its readiness to compensate the shareholders and undertook to adhere to the international convention of 1888 on the free use of the Suez Canal.

All the same, Britain, France and the United States qualified Egypt's action as unlawful and applied economic sanctions, sequestering her deposits in British, French and American banks. The United States cut off deliveries under the economic and technical aid agreement. The three Western powers also initiated a conference on the Suez problem, on which they intended to impose a decision restoring foreign control over the canal. It was to furnish legal grounds for forcible measures against Egypt. The composition of the conference was carefully selected, with seventeen of the twenty-two countries being members of NATO or other imperialist blocs. No Arab states, save Egypt, were invited.

In a statement on August 9, 1956, the Soviet Government denounced the aggressive manoeuvres of the Western powers and backed the Suez Canal nationalisation. It criticised the arbitrary choice of participants in the conference, but decided all the same to send its representatives there and seek an adjustment of the conflict in the interest of Egyptian independence and Middle East peace.

The conference opened in London in August 1956. The consistent Soviet stand and that of some of the independent Asian countries in behalf of Egypt's lawful rights, compelled the Western powers to concede the legality of nationalising the Suez Canal Company. Yet they countered with the so-called Dulles Plan, which envisaged mixed US, British and French control over the canal on the pretext of "ensuring freedom of shipping".

The Dulles Plan was an outright threat to Egypt's independence. The Soviet delegation opposed it firmly. It noted that the Egyptian Government had already guaranteed complete freedom of shipping via the canal. The Soviet spokesmen backed the Indian proposal, which provided for Egyptian control. The Soviet Union and the neutralist states thus frustrated the Dulles Plan. This deprived the imperialists of the opportunity to fall back on the decisions of the

conference in justifying their claims to the Suez Canal.

When the Suez Canal problem was discussed in the Security Council in October 1956, the Soviet delegate proved that the demand for "international control" was groundless and called for an agreement on the free use of the canal, which would remain in the possession and under the administration of Egypt. The Soviet initiative helped to agree the British and French view with that of Egypt.

Imperialist Aggression Against Egypt. Soviet Stand

Yet Britain and France went out of their way to scuttle the prospective settlement of the Suez conflict. Anthony Eden, who was Prime Minister of Britain at the time of the Suez Canal crisis, says in his memoirs that the British and French governments had, from the first, decided to use the nationalisation of the Suez Canal as a pretext to attack Egypt. They expected to crush the Republic, restore their control over the Suez Canal, make short work of the national liberation movement and re-establish imperialist domination over the Middle East. For this purpose, they made a compact with Israel. Ruling quarters in Israel were happy to accept the role of attacker with the object of seizing the Sinai Peninsula and other frontier areas.

It was no accident that the aggression against Egypt coincided in time with the counter-revolutionary uprising in Hungary. The imperialists hoped that events in Europe would eclipse those in the Middle East and divert public attention. On October 29, 1956, Israeli troops invaded Egyptian territory. Britain and France went into action in the Suez Canal Zone the following day. Having massed a large force in the area, the aggressors hoped to put Egypt on her knees with one blow.

The tenacious resistance of the Egyptians, coupled with the efforts of all progressives, frustrated the Anglo-French-Israeli plan. The Soviet Union took a prominent part in this. On October 31 the Soviet Government protested firmly against the unwarranted assault. It denounced the aggression as a gross breach of the peace and a violation of com-

mitments binding on the three countries in their capacity of UN members. The Soviet Union demanded an immediate cease-fire and the withdrawal of the invading troops.

Soviet spokesmen called on the United Nations to condemn the attack on Egypt as an unprovoked aggression and to compel the interventionists to evacuate their troops forthwith. They exposed the attempts of the imperialists, particularly those of the United States, to divert the General Assembly's attention from the aggression against Egypt and to involve it in a discussion of secondary matters.

The stand of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries infused the Egyptians with determination to safeguard their independence and inspired the freedom-loving nations to halt the interventionists. It prevented Britain and France from striking a deal with the United States at the expense of Middle East nations and led to the political isolation of the aggressor countries.

Most of the Arab states broke off diplomatic relations with Britain and France and announced their readiness to assist Egypt militarily. A conference of the Prime Ministers of Burma, Indonesia, Ceylon and India, which convened in November 1956, called for the swift withdrawal of the invading troops. Britain's Baghdad Pact allies also refused to have anything to do with her until she ceased hostilities. With unprecedented unanimity the General Assembly passed a resolution on November 2, 1956, on the immediate cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of interventionist troops from Egypt.

Britain, France and Israel ignored this demand. By November 5 the aggressors had seized the Sinai Peninsula and Port Said, creating a threat to Egypt's vital centres.

On November 5, 1956, when it became obvious that the imperialists intended to continue their intervention in defiance of the UN decision, the Soviet Government warned that it was ready, together with other UN members, to send its navy and air force and squash the Anglo-French-Israeli aggression. The USSR called on the governments, parliaments, political parties, trade unions and peoples of Britain, France and Israel to force a stop to the bloodshed and prevent the outbreak of a world war. It insisted that the Security Council should, in the event of the interventionists' refusing to leave Egypt, recommend the UN members,

primarily the Soviet Union and the United States, to render armed assistance to the victim of aggression.

The Soviet intention of giving military aid to Egypt had a sobering effect on the invaders. A few hours after it was published, the governments of Britain, France and Israel issued cease-fire orders. However, they refused to withdraw their troops until Egypt consented to "internationalise" the Suez Canal and make territorial concessions to Israel. Supported by the United States, they referred to the General Assembly resolution on sending "UN armed forces" to patrol the evacuated areas and insisted on their right to interfere in Egypt's internal affairs.

Again, the Soviet Government frustrated the imperialist manoeuvre. On November 10 TASS announced that if the aggressors did not withdraw their troops, which created the threat of a resumption of hostilities, the Soviet Union would not "hold back Soviet volunteers wishing to participate in the Egyptian people's struggle for independence".

Similar statements were made by the People's Republic of China, Afghanistan, Indonesia and the Arab states. At the close of 1956 and early in 1957, the Anglo-French troops had no other choice but to abandon Egypt, and Israeli troops were evacuated a short time later. The Egyptian Government's sovereignty was restored throughout the country. Soon, Britain and France admitted their claims as groundless by concluding an agreement under which Egypt would compensate the shareholders of the Suez Canal Company and users of the canal would pay their fees to the Egyptian administration.

The collapse of the Suez adventure impaired British and French influence in the Middle East. It demonstrated that the imperialists could no longer dominate in Asia and Africa, even with the help of arms. The Suez events underscored the decisive role played by the Soviet Union and the socialist system as a whole in protecting countries threatened by imperialist aggression. The international prestige of the Soviet Union climbed.

The outcome of the Anglo-French-Israeli intervention corroborated the conclusion drawn by the 20th Congress of the CPSU about the possibility of preventing war in the contemporary world and about the decisive influence of the socialist countries on world development.

Soviet Proposals on Shoring Up Peace and Security in the Middle East

The United States did not render any direct assistance to its allies in their armed venture against Egypt. It even approved the demand that foreign troops withdraw from Egyptian territory. This was because the US wished to take over British and French positions in the Middle East. Also, the US policy-makers were aware that outspoken solidarity with the aggressor nations would prejudice its prestige in Asia and Africa. All the same, the US imperialists backed them indirectly, hoping they would subvert the liberation movement. In the United Nations, US diplomats frustrated a resolution branding Britain, France and Israel as aggressors. Furthermore, Washington rejected the Soviet proposal for joint action against the aggression.

In early 1957, US Congress approved the so-called Eisenhower Doctrine. The President was given powers to send troops to any Middle East country to "combat" international communism. An annual \$200 million was allocated for economic "aid" to Middle East governments willing to fight "subversive activities", that is, to suppress the anti-imperialist movement.

By so doing, the United States stepped openly into the role of chief policeman in the Middle East, which had belonged to Britain before the Suez venture. The Eisenhower Doctrine amounted to undisguised interference in the internal affairs of Middle East states and carried the threat of a fresh aggravation in that region.

The Soviet Union did its utmost to block such a development. In a TASS statement published on January 13, 1957, the USSR laid bare the aggressive substance of the Eisenhower Doctrine. The following month, the Soviet Government called on the Western powers to assume a joint commitment to settle controversial Middle East problems solely by peaceful means based on respect for sovereignty, dismantlement of foreign war bases, non-involvement of the countries of that region in military blocs, non-delivery of arms to them, and economic assistance without political strings.

The Soviet proposal was designed to promote the national development of the Middle East and to make the region a zone of peace.

However, the Soviet programme, which could have paved the way to a dependable settlement, was turned down by the Western governments. Moreover, they refused to sign a joint declaration on the non-application of force in solving Middle East problems, as suggested in a Soviet note on April 19, 1957. As before, the United States and its allies hoped to establish their own order of things by force.

Collapse of the Imperialist Plot Against Syria (1957)

The US Government was determined to saddle the Middle East countries with unequal treaties based on the Eisenhower Doctrine. Many of them, Syria included, refused military co-operation with the United States. To break down Syria's resistance, Washington commenced to prepare an armed intervention. An army of 50,000, supported by 500 tanks, was massed on the Turkish-Syrian frontier. On the instigation of the United States, Israel organised border incidents. The threat of a war loomed large again in the Middle East.

The USSR took rapid and vigorous steps to safeguard peace and the independence of Syria. On September 3, 1957, the Soviet Government appealed to the United States and other Western powers to refrain from the use of force and from interference in the internal affairs of Middle East countries. Seeing that this appeal was ignored, it warned on September 10 that the would-be interventionists should recall the lessons of Suez. In mid-October, the CC CPSU sent messages to the British Labour Party and the Socialist parties of France, Italy and other West European countries, calling on them to act in behalf of peace and prevent an attack on Syria.

The Soviet Union let the public know what the aggressors had wished to conceal. The Soviet stand facilitated the struggle of Western progressives against the projected military venture. It helped to thwart the plans of the anti-Syrian coalition and bolstered the determination of the Arab states to support Syria.

Despite Western diplomatic dodges, the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries succeeded in placing a pertinent Syrian complaint on the agenda of the 12th UN General Assembly. At the Assembly, Soviet spokesmen backed the Syrian proposal of a committee to investigate the situation on the Turkish border and called on the United Nations for vigilance with regard to Western intimidation and blackmail in the Middle East. The vigorous stand of the Soviet Union and the other peace-loving countries compelled the US imperialists to abandon the idea of attacking Syria.

The United Arab Republic, consisting of the Egyptian and Syrian regions, was inaugurated on February 1, 1958. The union survived until 1961, when bitter controversies between its Syrian and Egyptian parts brought about a break. An independent Syrian Arab Republic was proclaimed on September 28, 1961.

Always loyal to the principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of other states, the Soviet Government showed the utmost respect for the constitutional changes in Syria and Egypt. It was one of the first governments to recognise the United Arab Republic, thus paralysing imperialist provocations against the new state. And after Syria stepped out of the UAR, the USSR maintained friendly relations with both republics.

Soviet Stand Against the Anglo-American Intervention in the Lebanon and Jordan

The lessons of their abortive ventures in Egypt and Syria were lost on the ruling groups of the United States and Britain. In 1958, they mounted a fresh intervention in the Middle East, creating an immediate danger of world war.

A mass movement had arisen in the Lebanon against the government of Camille Chamoun, which had concluded an agreement based on the Eisenhower Doctrine, thus prejudicing national interests. In May 1958, the movement developed into an armed uprising calling for Chamoun's retirement and for an official statement that the country would not participate in any aggressive blocs. To support their henchman, the imperialists dispatched warships to

Lebanon waters. They prompted Chamoun to complain to the United Nations about alleged subversive activity on the part of the United Arab Republic. The manoeuvre was meant to furnish UN cover for an imperialist intervention. In the Security Council, where the complaint was examined, US and British diplomats argued in favour of charging the UAR with "subversive activities" and pleaded "to protect the Lebanon from indirect aggression".

The Soviet spokesman, however, did not let them use the Security Council for imperialist ends. A Swedish compromise proposal was passed, providing for the dispatch of UN observers to the Lebanon. They were to establish whether the insurrectionists had received aid from abroad. When the UN observers refused to confirm the story of UAR intervention, Britain and the United States cast doubt on their findings. State Secretary Dulles announced publicly that the United States would send its troops into the country.

The anti-imperialist rising in Iraq gave the United States a pretext to launch an armed intervention hand in hand with Britain. On July 15, 1958, a force of US Marines landed in the Lebanon, and on July 17 and 18, a British air-borne force landed in Amman, the capital of Jordan, followed by the conclusion of a treaty on July 25 granting Britain the use of war bases in that country.

Once more, action was required to bridle the aggressors. In its statements of July 16 and 18, 1958, the Soviet Government exposed the hypocritical US and British claims of "safeguarding the independence" of the Lebanon and Jordan at the professed request of their governments. On July 19, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR emphasised in messages to the Heads of Government of the USA, Britain, France and India that the armed imperialist intervention in the Lebanon and Jordan and the threat of a similar aggression against Iraq and other Arab states "is liable to lead to extremely dangerous and unforeseen consequences and create the kind of chain reaction which it will no longer be possible to stop".

Among the immediate practical measures suggested by the Soviet Union was the withdrawal of occupation troops and the convocation of a conference of the Heads of Government of the United States, Britain, France and India to settle Middle East problems.

In July, the Soviet Union again censured the Western governments for interfering in Arab affairs. The governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and Israel were notified that the use of their territory and air space for passage of invasion troops was intolerable.

The Soviet Union and the other peace-loving countries prevented the imperialists from turning the United Nations into a screen for aggression. An extraordinary session of the General Assembly, on whose convocation the Soviet Union had insisted, rejected the United States proposal for approving the intervention and forming "UN armed forces to maintain peace in the Middle East". A resolution of the Arab states requiring an early withdrawal of foreign troops from the Lebanon and Jordan was passed unanimously. The United States and Britain had no choice but to vote for this resolution and to evacuate their troops in October-November 1958.

Thus, the interventionists did not succeed in consolidating the pro-imperialist regime in the Lebanon. A new Lebanese Government was formed, which proclaimed a neutral foreign policy and, in effect, refused to co-operate with the United States in the context of the Eisenhower Doctrine.

The 1958 Middle East crisis culminated in yet another spanking defeat for the imperialists, testifying to the growth of the peace-loving forces. The course of events showed once again that the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries were true champions of the freedom of the Eastern peoples.

Soviet Moves to Consolidate Middle East Peace

The international situation in the Middle East in recent years was marked by two basic trends: firstly, by the further unfolding of the liberation movement and the consolidation of the independence of Middle East countries, and, secondly, by unceasing interference on the part of the Western powers, principally the United States, with the object of enslaving the Middle East countries.

The imperialists are bent on provoking internal complications and conflicts between various Middle East states, and to sustain tension in the region.

Having failed to establish control over the Middle East through armed ventures, the imperialists are now combining threats, pressures and provocations with flirtation and occasional concessions to governments of countries they only recently attacked in force. Special stress is being laid on intimidating Arab leaders with the "peril of world communism" and on promises of generous aid. To prevent a united Arab anti-imperialist front, the Western powers go out of their way to play off the Arab states against each other, capitalising on differences arising between their ruling elements. Among other things, they exploit the royal governments of Jordan and Saudi Arabia for this purpose.

The imperialists are keeping up tension in the relations between CENTO members and the neutralist Middle East states. Besides, they are delivering modern arms to Israel. Britain has massed troops in the principalities of the Arabian Peninsula still under her control, while the United States is keeping its 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean. The oil monopolies, financed and organised by reactionary anti-popular forces, are playing a leading part in this subversive campaign.

Yet the imperialists are unable to prevent the liberation struggle from scoring fresh successes and the Middle East countries from consolidating their security.

On July 14, 1958, an anti-imperialist uprising flared up in Iraq, which the imperialists considered their main stronghold in the Arab East. King Faisal's feudal compradore government was overthrown, and a republic was proclaimed. The government, headed by Abdul Karim Kassem, announced a series of progressive reforms and inaugurated an independent foreign policy.

The USSR helped frustrate Western efforts to politically isolate and then invade Iraq. After the Soviet Union and 29 other socialist and neutralist states recognised the Republic of Iraq, the Western powers had no choice but to follow suit. Sincerely eager to help the young republic, the Soviet Government concluded an agreement with it for economic and technical co-operation on March 16, 1959, and granted it credits of 550 million (old) rubles to purchase industrial equipment in the USSR.

The support of the Soviet Union and other peace-loving states enabled Iraq to consolidate its political independence. In March 1959, the Iraqi Government announced its withdrawal from the aggressive Baghdad line-up and insisted on the evacuation of British troops from the country. An agreement with the United States on military and economic aid was repealed in May. This amounted to an outright rejection of the Eisenhower Doctrine. A state-owned oil company was formed to invigorate the economy.

However, Kassem's government was afraid to lean too heavily on the people. It made increasing concessions to reactionaries and procrastinated with the promised democratic reforms. When the people began to clamour for these reforms, Kassem, who had established a personal dictatorship, responded with reprisals and suppressed the progressive forces. By so doing, his government isolated itself from the people, and extreme Rightist political groups hastened to make the most of the situation. A military coup on February 8, 1963, overthrew Kassem. The Baath Party (Socialist Party of Arab Revival), which played the principal part in the coup, came to power.

Replying to an inquiry of the new Iraqi Government, the Soviet Union announced that it would maintain diplomatic relations with the Republic of Iraq in the interests of friendship and co-operation. In defining its position, the Soviet Government pointed out that only the people have the right to decide on the form of government in their country. In this sense, it said, respect for sovereignty is the key principle of international relations.

The Baath government professed to be democratic. In reality, it launched a reactionary anti-popular policy, instituted a reign of terror and extermination of Communist Party members, the leaders of other Iraqi mass organisations and the champions of peace, and resumed a war of annihilation against the Kurds, who were demanding autonomy within the framework of the Republic of Iraq. This policy created deep-going discontent and led to a new coup on November 18, 1963. In February 1964, the new Iraqi Government ceased hostilities against the Kurds and guaranteed their national rights within the Republic. However, a fresh offensive of government troops was

mounted in April 1965. Iraqi progressives called insistently for a peaceful solution of the Kurd question.

Iraq's withdrawal from the Baghdad alignment enfeebled that aggressive bloc, which was promptly renamed CENTO (Central Treaty Organisation). Britain's position within CENTO was much weakened. Officially, the United States preferred to stay out of the group, but took urgent measures to reinforce it. On March 5, 1959, in Ankara, it concluded bilateral alliances with CENTO members, envisaging US military assistance to Iran, Turkey and Pakistan. On the strength of the Ankara agreements, the United States gained the right, "if necessary", to station its bases and troops in the territories of the three countries.

The new military alliances are spearheaded against the Soviet Union and the independent Middle East states. Also, they prejudice the national interests of Turkey, Iran and Pakistan, imposing extravagant military expenditures on them and facilitating the further penetration of overseas monopolies into their economy.

The Soviet Government censured the new military alliances, declaring in March 1959 that it could not help regarding them as hostile acts against the Soviet Union and world peace. The USSR warned that it had drawn the due conclusions from the Ankara agreements in respect of its own defences and called on the people of Turkey, Iran and Pakistan to be vigilant and not allow themselves to be involved in aggressive ventures.

Nothing the imperialists did could prevent their grip on the Middle East from slipping. A powerful national liberation movement developed in Cyprus. In the United Nations, where the question of Cyprus was debated in 1957 and 1958, Soviet spokesmen exposed the British imperialists, who attempted to keep up the colonial regime there under the signboard of a "constitutional reform". In 1960, Britain was compelled to recognise the island's independence. However, it imposed the so-called Zurich and Geneva agreements on the young state, under which Britain kept her war bases and "guarantees" were issued by Britain, Turkey and Greece. Despite imperialist pressure, the Republic of Cyprus declined participation in aggressive alliances and started to consolidate her independence. The imperialists provoked clashes between the Turkish and

Greek populations of the island in late 1963 and, under the pretext of "ensuring safety", Britain sent her troops into many regions of the Republic under the "guarantees" agreement. In the meanwhile, the United States insisted that the island be occupied by NATO armed forces.

The Soviet Union took a firm stand in behalf of Cyprus. A TASS statement on January 31, 1964, stressed that the Cypriot people were the only ones entitled to deal with questions concerning their further development. The Western powers, it was hoped, would refrain from steps imperilling peace in the region. In a message to the Heads of Government of Britain, the United States, France, Turkey and Greece on February 7, the USSR appealed for restraint and for a realistic appraisal of the consequences of an armed invasion. It urged respect for Cyprus sovereignty and independence.

The Soviet stand helped the Cypriot Government to resist the imperialist intrigues. It refused to allow NATO troops into the country, annulled the unequal 1960 treaty on "guarantees", yet agreed to a short-term stationing of "UN forces to maintain order in Cyprus".

In August 1964, imperialist agents again provoked armed clashes between the Turkish and Greek communities. The United States tried to take advantage of the situation and devised a plan of abolishing the Republic of Cyprus by dividing the country between Greece and Turkey, which would have enabled it to expand the NATO bases on the island. The Soviet Union stood up for the independence of Cyprus. It pressed the United Nations to take all necessary measures for the implementation of the Security Council decisions concerning a peaceful settlement.

Due to continuing provocations, the Soviet Union warned on August 16 that if "matters go to the length of an invasion of the Republic of Cyprus, the Soviet Union will not stay on the sidelines" and will help "defend Cypriot freedom and independence against foreign intervention". The aggressive forces knew the Cypriots' determination to safeguard their independence and Soviet readiness to assist Cyprus. This made them back down.

Continuing its efforts for a détente, the Soviet Government issued a communique in November 1964 on its negotiations with Turkey, which again stated its wish of "a

peaceful solution of the Cyprus question based on respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus, on the observance of the lawful rights of the two national communities which assure them a peaceful life, and on the recognition that two national communities exist on the island".

Soviet Relations with the Arab Countries

In September 1962, insurgent patriots swept out the corrupt monarchy in Yemen. The Soviet Government was one of the first to recognise the Yemen Arab Republic, declaring that it considered "all interference in Yemen's internal affairs impermissible". This helped Yemen to preserve its sovereignty against the armed provocations of the imperialists and their henchmen.

In March 1964, during the visit to the USSR of the President of Yemen, a new Friendship Treaty was concluded. The Soviet Union and Yemen expressed a common point of view on the ways and means of strengthening Middle East peace, and, among other things, declared themselves in favour of the UAR proposal that foreign bases be abolished in the territories of Arab countries and Cyprus.

The political independence of the Middle East Arab countries grew distinctly more solid. This gave fresh scope to the national liberation movement of the Arab nations.

The United Arab Republic embarked on socialist development. Laws were passed nationalising banks, insurance companies, big and medium industrial enterprises. Heavy industry, consumer industries, transport, foreign trade and domestic wholesale commerce were integrated in the state sector. A blow was also struck at the big landowners. Measures were taken to democratise the country's political life and to improve the living standard.

In Syria, the reactionary section of the Baath Party was dismissed from power after a keen internal struggle. Headed by Left-wing Baathists, the government prohibited the granting of oil concessions to foreign firms. In early 1965, it passed decrees on the nationalisation of the property of the big bourgeoisie. Imperialist agents endeavoured to organise a counter-revolutionary coup, but failed.

In Iraq, too, foreign and local private banks, insurance companies, and some enterprises, were nationalised in the summer of 1964.

The social changes in the foremost Middle East countries, coupled with revolutionary reconstruction in Algeria, impelled greater co-operation among Arab states in the struggle against imperialism and extended their ties with the socialist countries. The overthrow of General Ibrahim Abboud's military dictatorship in Sudan in October 1964 gave added impetus to these trends.

Despite imperialist intrigues, a conference of 13 Arab states was held in Cairo in January 1964. Its participants voiced their determination "to put an end to existing contradictions and take measures to invigorate relations between the fraternal Arab countries". The conference gave its backing to the liberation struggles of the people of Aden, Oman, Angola, etc., and hailed the Moscow Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and the measures designed to bring about general disarmament.

In September 1964, at their second conference, the 13 Arab governments demanded the dismantlement of foreign bases in the Arab East. Unanimously, they approved the project of a joint irrigation scheme on the Jordan River and its tributaries and allocated 16,500,000 Egyptian pounds for it. A unified military command was formed as a defensive measure against Israeli aggression. In 1959-62, the Middle East Arab states agreed on joint oil prospecting and on an oil-line project. An Arab common market consisting of the United Arab Republic, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Kuwait and Jordan was inaugurated on January 1, 1965. All these measures loosened the economic grip of the Western monopolies.

The main objective of the imperialists today is to disrupt the co-operation prevailing between the Arab states and the Soviet Union. But their efforts are doomed to failure. Co-operation on the High Aswan Dam project is an indication why they will fail. After many fruitless attempts to transact a deal with the Western powers, the UAR Government requested Soviet help in building a dam on the Nile to irrigate arid land and supply electric power for the Republic's industrial enterprises. The Soviet Union gratified the request and agreed to furnish credit and equipment,

and specialists to help build the first and second sections of the dam. It also agreed to train national personnel in operating the project.

In May 1964, the people of Egypt celebrated the inauguration of the first section of the dam, which, when completed, will irrigate two million feddans of arable. During the stay in Moscow of the UAR Prime Minister in September 1964 an understanding was reached that the Soviet Union will collaborate in the building of metallurgical, engineering, power-generating and other enterprises.

Co-operation with other countries of the Arab East is making good headway. The Soviet Union supports their lawful anti-imperialist demands, particularly that of independence for Britain's colonies on the Arabian Peninsula. The Soviet stand is a dependable guarantee of the Arab countries' security.

Soviet Relations with Afghanistan, Turkey and Iran

The Soviet Government has always attached importance to its relations with its southern neighbours—Afghanistan, Turkey and Iran. Lenin denounced the chauvinist policies of the Russian tsar and advocated fraternal friendship with the three countries. Afghanistan, Turkey and Iran were among the first countries with which the Soviet Republic developed good-neighbour relations.

Enduring friendly contacts between the Soviet Union and Afghanistan have by now become traditional. A new chapter in Soviet-Afghan friendship was opened by the 1955 agreement reached during the visit of a Soviet Government delegation to Kabul on expanding economic and technical co-operation and the building with Soviet help of a hydropower station and irrigation schemes. The Soviet Union made available to Afghanistan technical help and long-term credits of \$100 million. The 1931 Treaty on Neutrality and Mutual Non-aggression was prolonged for another ten years. In 1960, the Soviet Union and Afghanistan concluded a cultural co-operation agreement. In a joint communique on April 30, 1965, the two countries observed with satisfaction the truly friendly nature of their relations and

expressed the view that Soviet-Afghan "co-operation and friendship are an excellent model of the peaceful co-existence of countries with different economic, social and political conditions". During the visit to the USSR of the King of Afghanistan in the summer of 1965, the two countries reaffirmed their wish to promote friendship and co-operation.

The Soviet Union is eager to establish similar friendly relations with Turkey. In 1953, the Soviet Government issued assurances that the USSR had no territorial claims on Turkey and suggested settling the Black Sea Straits question on a mutually acceptable basis.

Soviet efforts led to a certain improvement of economic ties and to positive solutions of a number of Soviet-Turkish problems. Trade between the two countries expanded. Soviet organisations participated in industrial exhibitions and helped to build a glass-making factory in Turkey.

However, difficulties have been springing up now and then in Soviet-Turkish relations. Turkey's ruling quarters made her territory available for US war bases and for NATO manoeuvres near the borders of the socialist countries. The Soviet Government pointed out repeatedly that such acts were counter to good-neighbour relations. At the same time, it stressed the many available opportunities for business contacts and expressed its readiness to revive the traditional Soviet-Turkish friendship.

At the close of 1964, Turkey's Foreign Minister visited Moscow for the first time since the war. The two sides agreed to work for better good-neighbour relations based on the principles of respect for independence, territorial integrity and equality. Making a practical step in this direction, they decided to increase reciprocal trade and signed an agreement on cultural and scientific contacts. During the Soviet Foreign Minister's visit to Ankara in May 1965, the two countries reaffirmed their wish to act on the traditions moulded at the time of Lenin and Kemal Atatürk and to concentrate on developing friendly and good-neighbour relations, and on strengthening mutual confidence to the benefit of both countries. The visit to the Soviet Union of Suat Hayri Urganlı, the Prime Minister of the Turkish Republic, in August 1965, proved highly beneficial for the further development of Soviet-Turkish relations.

Despite imperialist opposition, the Soviet Union has succeeded in achieving a distinct improvement of Soviet-Iranian relations. Financial and border issues were settled to the satisfaction of both sides in 1954. In 1957, an agreement was reached on Iran-bound freight transit via the Soviet Union and on the joint use of the water and power resources of the frontier rivers. The goodwill of the Soviet Union was also underscored by the free transfer to Iran of the Soviet share in the property of the Kevir-Hurian stock company, whose term did not expire until 1995.

In 1959, reactionary Iranian groups scuttled negotiations with the Soviet Union begun on the initiative of Teheran. The object of the negotiations was to conclude a treaty of friendship and non-aggression. This was followed by a statement in which Iran revoked a number of articles of the 1921 Treaty and announced the conclusion of an alliance with the United States, which was stepping up war preparations on Iranian territory.

This created a strain in Soviet-Iranian relations, later relieved by the efforts of both sides. In 1962, the Government of Iran assured the Soviet Union that it would not allow any foreign state to station rocket bases and use the territory of Iran for hostile actions against the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union received this undertaking with deep satisfaction, hoping that it would serve as a start in the elimination of obstacles to greater Soviet-Iranian friendship. The visit to Iran of Leonid Brezhnev, then Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, on November 16-23, 1963, was a fresh contribution to the bettering of Soviet-Iranian relations. The official visit to the USSR of the Shah of Iran (June 21-July 3, 1965) and the exchange of opinions held during this visit, furthered mutual understanding and good-neighbour relations. The sides agreed that it is necessary to work for enduring peace and a relaxation of international tension, and favoured unconditional fulfilment of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The Soviet Union and Iran expressed their readiness to greatly expand economic, scientific, technical and cultural co-operation and to exploit all available opportunities for a further extension of mutually advantageous trade.

The Soviet Union's friendly relations with the Middle East countries are an important factor in the promotion of peace and of the independence of the peoples of that region.

Soviet good-neighbour relations with Afghanistan, Iran, Pakistan and Turkey ensure peace and order along the Soviet Union's southern frontiers. They also promote a relaxation of international tension, further the vital interests of the people and help frustrate imperialism's aggressive designs. Good-neighbour relations are a sure road to enduring contacts between states with different social systems, and to a dependable peace.

CHAPTER IV

THE SOVIET UNION AND THE AFRICAN COUNTRIES

AFRICAN PEOPLES FIGHT FOR INDEPENDENCE

The colonial powers were in complete control of the African continent until the Second World War. Egypt, Ethiopia and Liberia were the only countries that had the status of independent states. The South African Union was—and still is—ruled by white capitalists and land-owners who oppress the Africans cruelly and act as the conductors and commanders of colonialism.

The imperialists exploited Africa as a market for their goods, an area of investment, a source of cheap raw materials and a staging ground for military ventures. Having lost their main Asian colonies within a few years of the war, they viewed Africa as the principal bastion of colonialism, and did their utmost to perpetuate their rule. But the colonialists were not able to suppress the liberation movement of the African peoples. In the favourable international climate which appeared as the socialist system developed and many of the Asian peoples won their independence, the movement developed into an anti-imperialist revolution, sweeping the entire continent. In all the stages of the just struggle, the peoples of Africa could rely on Soviet assistance.

Soviet Stand in UN for the Rights of African Peoples

The Soviet Union prevented an imperialist redivision of the Italian colonies when the Second World War ended, though Britain, France and the United States clamoured for

it. When the future of the territories concerned was discussed in the United Nations in 1949, the Soviet Government instantly suggested that Lybia be granted independence, that foreign troops be withdrawn and foreign bases there be dismantled. The Soviet delegation exposed the Western manoeuvre aimed at perpetuating colonial control by partitioning Lybia. The Soviet stand speeded the adoption of a decision to grant Lybia independence not later than January 1, 1952. Soviet efforts also reduced the term of the trusteeship over former Italian Somaliland, which subsequently facilitated the founding of an independent republic.

Soviet spokesmen in the Trusteeship Council, the General Assembly and other UN bodies branded the predacious imperialist policies in Africa and called on all countries to observe the UN Charter principle about the equality and self-determination of peoples. At the First Session of the UN General Assembly, the Soviet Union denounced the British, French and Belgian projects of trusteeship agreements for Tanganyika, Togo, the Cameroons and Ruanda-Urundi. Soviet diplomats showed that the projects were incompatible with the UN Charter, since they envisaged the right of trustees "to govern trust territories as integral parts of their own territory" and allowed them to maintain military bases there. The Soviet Union insisted that specific dates be named when the trust territories would be granted independence and that trustees be obligated to carry through progressive reforms. Time and again, at all General Assemblies, Soviet spokesmen exposed the designs of colonialists who wished "to keep the peoples of trust territories in a dependent state for several generations".¹

What Britain wanted was to attach the trust territory of Tanganyika to a group of her contiguous possessions, to which the people of Tanganyika objected. The Soviet stand on this score, backed by a number of Asian countries, frustrated the British plan.

The Soviet delegation came out strongly against French repressions in the trust territory of the Cameroons during elections to the local Assembly and supported the call of

¹ *SSSR i strany Afriki, 1946-1962, Documents, Vol. I, Gospolitizdat, 1963, p. 343.*

progressive Cameroons organisations for new elections in the presence of UN observers. Through the Trusteeship Council and, subsequently, at the 11th General Assembly (early 1957), the Soviet Government submitted a draft resolution providing for the independence of trust territories within a few years. This proposal was one of the instruments that squashed attempts to perpetuate the colonial order by means of the trusteeship system.

In 1960-62, Somali, the Cameroons, Togo, Tanganyika and Ruanda-Urundi became independent. In a telegram to the Soviet Government, the head of Togo's first national government expressed "gratitude for the full support which the delegation of the USSR brought to bear unflinchingly in the United Nations during Togo's struggle for independence".¹

Ever since the United Nations was founded, Soviet spokesmen have been calling attention to the condition of the peoples in African colonies. At the 8th General Assembly, which discussed the non-self-governing territories. Soviet diplomats supplied convincing facts and figures about the predacious policies of Britain and France in Africa. They exposed the ineptitude of British and French measures there as regards education and public health. At the 10th General Assembly, the Soviet spokesman made public numerous facts of racial discrimination in British East and Central Africa. In the teeth of vehement colonialist objections the Soviet Union succeeded in having African representatives invited to UN committee sittings dealing with the non-self-governing territories.

Between 1952 and 1955 the Soviet Union took an active part in General Assembly discussions of the Tunisian and Moroccan questions. The Soviet delegation demanded that the national aspirations of the peoples of Tunisia and Morocco be satisfied and that their state sovereignty be recognised forthwith. This went a long way in facilitating their independence, proclaimed in 1956.

Soviet support of just proposals submitted to the United Nations by young African states speeded the adoption of important General Assembly decisions. The 16th General Assembly, for one, passed a resolution calling on all con-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 544.

cerned to proclaim Africa a denuclearised zone. The atrocities of the colonialists in Angola, and their refusal to grant Angolans human rights and basic freedoms were strongly censured. In May 1961, the Soviet Government published a statement on the situation in that country. It pointed out that it was the duty of all governments and peoples "to compel Portugal to cease the predacious colonial war in Angola".¹

Soviet spokesmen in the UN keep on exposing the misdeeds of Portugal's fascist rulers.

Ever since 1946, when the General Assembly first examined the question of racial discrimination in the South African Union (South African Republic since 1961), the USSR has been calling perseveringly for a stop to apartheid, which is incompatible with UN principles. Time and again, the Soviet Government protested against the unlawful annexation of South-West Africa by the SAR colonialists. The 16th General Assembly confirmed the right to independence of the people of South-West Africa and demanded that the South African Republic evacuate her troops and release all political prisoners.

The 17th General Assembly, held in 1962, examined the situation in Angola, Northern and Southern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Kenya, Mozambique, etc. The Soviet delegation exposed the abuses of the colonialists and called for urgent United Nations measures compelling the imperialists to act in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonies.

The General Assembly denounced the racist policies of the SAR authorities and made its former decisions on this score more specific. Among other things, it called on all governments to apply political and economic sanctions against the SAR, not short of boycott and rupture of diplomatic relations.

Between 1963 and 1965 inclusive, the Soviet delegation to the 18th and 19th General Assemblies and the Security Council fought on with resolve against imperialist interference in the Congo.

The Soviet stand against colonialism is inspiring oppressed peoples to fight on with greater determination. It is

¹ *SSSR i strany Afriki*, Vol. II, p. 301.

furthering their unification and promoting greater friendly contacts between the Soviet Union and the African countries, while isolating the colonialists.

Soviet Assistance to the People of Algeria

France rejected the Algerians' plea for independence out of hand. In 1954, Algerian patriots had no choice but to begin an armed struggle, headed by the National Liberation Front. The Front was supported by the Communist Party and other Algerian progressive organisations. As the years went by, the war in Algeria became increasingly bitter and bloody. But nothing the colonialists did, could break the will of the Algerians.

In 1958, the National Liberation Front proclaimed the inauguration of the Algerian Republic under a Provisional Government which repeatedly offered France to negotiate. In reply, Paris demanded the unconditional surrender of the National Liberation Army and the approval of the "French Algeria" formula as a preliminary to the talks.

In 1959, after numerous French military setbacks, President de Gaulle announced France's intention to recognise the Algerians' right to self-determination. But this was a move aimed at splitting the liberation movement and placating public opinion at home, which was clamouring for an end to the "dirty war" that had claimed tens of thousands of French lives.

In 1960, the French delegates scuttled the negotiations with the Provisional Government of Algeria by laying down conditions incompatible with sovereignty. To compel Algeria to surrender, military operations were re-opened and a reign of terror was instituted by fascist OAS gangs.¹ However, all efforts to solve the Algerian problem by force proved abortive. Despite the intrigues of French agents, the national movement remained united and its armed forces stood their ground with eminent success against the colonial armies.

The working people of France denounced the imperialist policy of France's ruling quarters. In a referendum in

¹ OAS, l'Organisation armée secrète.

January 1961, as many as 15,200,000 Frenchmen spoke out for Algeria's self-determination, and only 6,000,000 voted against it.

The success of the Algerian liberation struggle was furthered by the unflinching support of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. In 1956, when the French Premier visited Moscow, the Soviet Government told him it wished that the legitimate rights of the people be taken into account in the settlement of the Algerian problem. Soviet spokesmen insisted on this, too, during discussions of the Algerian problem at the 11th, 12th and 13th General Assemblies. Recommendations were issued to help the French-Algerian negotiators to find a peaceful democratic solution.

The Soviet public welcomed the inauguration of the Algerian Republic.

In September 1960, the Soviet Union announced its de facto recognition of the Algerian Government. The friendly support and the various forms of aid extended to the Algerian liberation struggle by the USSR added strength to the international position of the young republic and helped it to resist the colonialists' plans.

In 1961, France was compelled to resume negotiations with Algeria. The talks culminated in the Evian agreements¹ on March 18, 1962, providing for a cease-fire and the recognition of Algerian independence on the condition that the majority of Algeria's population approve it by a referendum.

In the referendum, more than 99 per cent of the electorate voted for independence.

On July 3, 1962, Algeria became a sovereign state and on September 25, the Algerian People's Democratic Republic was proclaimed.

The Soviet Union has also firmly supported other African peoples. Thirty-two new states appeared in Africa between 1956 and 1965. In 1965, their total climbed to 36 (excluding the South African Republic). Yet colonial possessions still survive on the continent. They occupy about 4,500,000 sq. kilometres, or 14 per cent of its area, and their popu-

¹ Named after Evian-les-Bains, the French town where the two delegations met.

lation adds up to about 15,000,000, or 5 per cent, of the total population. The time is not far distant when all the peoples of Africa will regain their freedom and independence.

SOVIET SUPPORT OF THE YOUNG AFRICAN STATES

Western Imperialist Policy in Africa

The imperialists employ every possible dodge to retain their outposts on the African continent. In some countries, they have succeeded in transferring power to henchmen who obediently pursue a pro-imperialist policy in defiance of their peoples. Furthermore, the metropolitan countries have saddled some of the young states with unequal military and political agreements. France, for example, has made many of her former possessions accept the commitment to stay in the franc zone and to conclude no economic agreements with third countries before consulting France. Military bases remained on their territories. Similar commitments were wrested from some of her ex-colonies by Britain. With foreign advisers installed in government offices and foreign monopolies dominant in their economy, such commitments are making big inroads into the independence of the young states.

The former metropolitan countries make the most of the financial and economic weakness and the backwardness of the countries concerned to keep them in submission by means of commercial restrictions, refusal of credits, withdrawal of capital, and the like. The monopolists are not loath to give handouts to the governing groups, obtaining important political and economic concessions in return for insignificant food gifts or subsidies.

The imperialists hit on the method of "collective colonialism" to exploit Africa. They attempted to draw African countries into the West European Common Market, dominated by West German and French monopolies. African countries are being cast in the role of buyers of manufactured goods at high prices and suppliers of raw materials at low prices. What the neo-colonialists want is to erect insuperable barriers to the development of national industries in Africa.

The expansion of US imperialism is the most dangerous of all. In the first few years after the war, the United States believed that colonial regimes would prevail in Africa for many years to come, and used the good services of the metropolitan powers to penetrate into that continent. Under the Marshall Plan and the Mutual Security Act they obtained special privileges for the extraction of strategic raw materials and the setting up of war bases in Africa. Private US investments climbed from \$130 million in 1943 to \$774 million in 1955. Between 1945 and 1960, the United States granted \$835 million in "aid" for military purposes, chiefly to colonies of the West European powers, and imposed agreements providing for US air bases in Morocco, Lybia and Liberia.

Although the colonial system is crumbling rapidly, the United States is helping its allies of the various military blocs to combat the national liberation movement. At the same time, it is trying to exploit the independence struggles of Africans to seize positions formerly held by its West European rivals. The United States is making broad use of neo-colonialist methods. The recommendations worked out in 1961 by a group of experts on the instructions of the US Government show what these methods are. The experts advised against supporting a "French Algeria" and urged non-association with Portugal on the Angola question. They recommended promoting "stable governments" in Africa or, in other words, transferring power to pro-imperialist African leaders who would ensure US access to raw materials and satisfy US "strategic needs". The recommendations, to which American diplomacy suited its actions, acknowledged that colonialism had no future in Africa, yet betrayed the craving of US monopolists to gain a grip on the former colonies of their partners.

The United States extols "collective colonialism" and objects to "the division of Africa into spheres of interest", that is, to any special privileges for former metropolitan countries. Washington is bent on keeping Africa within the capitalist fold as a semi-colony and a source of raw materials. It obstructs the progressive domestic and foreign policies of independent states and seeks to involve them

in various aggressive acts. What the US monopolists want to achieve most is for Africans to reject contacts with the socialist countries.

The above-mentioned report by US experts recommended increasing "aid" to Africa in all spheres—financial, economic, educational, through the United Nations, etc.

Despite vehement publicity and extensive US diplomatic efforts, most African countries show restraint with regard to American promises. The main reason is that US "aid" is invariably given on hard terms and has political strings. For one thing, the United States refused to credit a power project in Ghana after President Nkrumah one day criticised the Western powers. Besides, the United States does not hesitate to intervene with force in the internal affairs of African states.

African Countries Seek to Consolidate Their Independence

The most important thing the young African states have to do is consolidate their independence and combat colonialism in all its shapes and forms. Many of them have already achieved a partial or complete annulment of unequal agreements, weakening the political and military positions of the former metropolitan countries.

Guinea has refused to stay within the French community and denounced its military agreements with Paris. The Mali Republic has compelled the French to dismantle some of their military bases. The Government of Morocco, too, has seen to the liberation and reunification of the so-called international zone and of Spanish Morocco, annexed by the imperialists in 1912.

Some of the African countries have established an independent exchange rate for their national currency, instituted state banks, set up controls over foreign trade and nationalised the property of some foreign monopolies. Many countries are developing national industries with the friendly assistance of the socialist states. They do not refuse economic co-operation with the Western powers, provided it conforms with their national interests and does not induce revival of colonialism.

In the prevailing conditions, the non-capitalist path is developing into a realistic prospect for many of the African countries, regardless of their level of development. This is attested to by the socio-economic measures taken in the United Arab Republic, Algeria, Mali and other countries. The Mali Republic has set out on developing state industries and on promoting peasant co-operatives, ruling out the emergence of capitalism.

Consolidation of independence is proceeding in an acute struggle against the colonialists, who, in some cases, resort to armed force. As far back as 1958, the Government of Tunisia insisted on the evacuation of French troops. Some French troops, however, remained at the Bizerta naval base. In 1961, Tunisia demanded that these, too, abandon the country. In reply, the French mounted a military action with the object of imposing new unequal agreements on Tunisia.

The firm stand of the Soviet Union and other peace-loving states had a strong bearing on the outcome of the Bizerta conflict. A Tunisian representative came to Moscow in early August 1961 on a special mission from the President of the Republic. The Soviet Foreign Minister told him that the USSR "will continue to support Tunisia, both within and without the UN framework, in her struggle to consolidate her independence".¹

In the Security Council and at the General Assembly, which examined Tunisia's complaint, Soviet spokesmen exposed the diplomatic manoeuvres of the French imperialists and their abettors. The General Assembly censured the stationing of occupation troops in Tunisia as a violation of that country's sovereignty and a threat to international peace. France was compelled to evacuate the captured areas, and in October 1963 recalled her last remaining troops and wound up her base in Bizerta.

In early 1964, the Soviet Government acted in defence of the countries of East Africa, imperilled by an imperialist intervention. On January 27, a Soviet Foreign Ministry statement exposed British and American military preparations against the People's Republic of Zanzibar and Pemba, warning that all acts of violence "by those who do not

¹ *Pravda*, August 6, 1961.

wish to part with their privileges will be qualified as an act of international piracy, with all the ensuing dangerous consequences". On February 14, TASS published a statement concerning the shipment of British troops to Kenya, Tanganyika and Uganda. It laid bare the substance of the Western neo-colonialist move and wished the peoples of East Africa "the quickest possible termination of the dangerous situation created by the presence of foreign troops in their territory".

Soviet Stand Against the Imperialist Aggression in the Congo

The Soviet Government took a firm stand against imperialist interference in the domestic affairs of the Congo Republic (Leopoldville), in behalf of genuine sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity.

In June 1960, Belgium was compelled to recognise Congo's independence. The attempt to put colonialist agents in power had failed. The first national government was headed by Patrice Lumumba, leader of the progressive National Congo Movement Party. His government announced it would lose no time in consolidating independence and demanded the evacuation of Belgian troops. It established relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

The colonialists countered with a conspiracy against the young republic. Local reactionaries were goaded to action by the big Belgian monopolies, notably Union Minière du Haut Katanga, which controlled uranium and copper mines in Katanga and was closely connected with US, British and French monopolies.

The colonialists incited unrest in Leopoldville and moved troops into the capital and other Congolese towns on the pretext of "protecting European lives and property". Instantly, the head of the local Katanga administration and a Belgian stooge, Moise Tshombe, proclaimed the "independence" of Katanga Province. It was planned to overthrow the progressive Lumumba government and partition the country. The colonialists banked on a swift success, but encountered dogged resistance on the part of the

people. The Congo Republic ruptured diplomatic relations with Belgium and organised defence.

The Soviet Government warned Belgium, the United States, Britain and France "of the great responsibility shouldered by the governing groups of the Western powers for starting an armed aggression in the Congo". It informed the Congo Republic of its readiness to render "every assistance that may be required to safeguard her independence".

The Soviet action deprived the Western powers of a chance to afford outright military and political support to Belgium. So the imperialists decided to act through the United Nations, to which the young republic had appealed for help. On July 14, 1960, the Security Council called on Belgium to withdraw her troops from Congolese territory and decided to render the necessary military assistance to the Lumumba government. This decision was backed by the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries. A number of neutralist states agreed to send their armed forces to the Congo as part of the "UN force".

The UN Secretary-General should have consulted the lawful government and taken appropriate measures to drive out the interventionists and annul the artificial partition of the Congo. But the late Dag Hammarskjöld, then the Secretary-General, used the UN intervention to uphold imperialist interests. The UN command disarmed troops loyal to the Republic. The Lumumba government was not allowed to use radio stations, airfields and other means of transport, over which the "UN troops" hastened to assume control. The UN Secretary-General flaunted the elementary rules of international law and sovereignty and obstructed the shipment to the Congo even of non-military aid from the socialist and neutralist states, while the interventionists and Tshombe were freely supplied arms by NATO countries.

The Soviet Government tried to end this activity, hostile to the Congolese. It demanded that the UN command abide by the decisions of the international organisation. Western diplomats in the Security Council turned down the Soviet plan for the settlement of the Congolese question.

In the meantime, the imperialists formed a puppet government in Leopoldville. Gangs armed on US money

arrested Prime Minister Lumumba, whom they later surrendered to the Katanga authorities. In February 1961, he was brutally assassinated by Tshombe's men. The colonialists expected they would now easily dismember the country and establish firm control over it.

However, the Congolese people, backed by the peace-loving forces of the world, frustrated the plan for abolishing the Congo Republic.

In messages to European, Asian, African and Latin American governments, the Soviet Union presented incontrovertible proof exposing the complicity of the Western powers in the assassination of Prime Minister Lumumba and demanded an immediate stop to imperialist interference in Congolese affairs. It insisted that the United Nations fulfil its obligations to the Congolese people.

The Soviet action impeded various colonial manoeuvres and prompted the 15th General Assembly to pass a resolution ensuring Congo's unity in April 1961. Anxious to avoid discreditation among African peoples, the Western powers were unable to prevent the establishment of a united Central Government, the entry of UN troops into Katanga and the dissolution of the Tshombe gangs. The rivalry between the United States, which put its stakes on pro-Western Leopoldville leaders, and Britain and Belgium, who backed the Katanga separatists, also had a certain bearing on this development. The imperialists had banished Lumumba followers from the Central Government after exposing them to cruel reprisals, and pinned considerable hopes on the "maintenance of law and order" in the Congo by "UN troops", whose departure they delayed in every possible way.

The Soviet Government voiced strong opposition to the UN flag being used as a screen for neo-colonialist manoeuvres. A Soviet spokesman protested against the stay of "UN troops" in the Congo for purely police functions and wrote to the Secretary-General of the UN on March 2, 1963:

"The people, parliament and government of the Congo Republic must be given a chance to settle their own affairs."

In 1964, the "UN operation in the Congo" was terminated under pressure of the peace-loving forces and UN troops were withdrawn from the country. US attempts to "stabilise"

the anti-popular regime in Leopoldville failed. Congolese patriots led by the Leopoldville Congo National Liberation Council began an armed struggle against the imperialist henchmen. By the summer of 1964, the Council had liberated one-sixth of the country and in August occupied Stanleyville, capital of Eastern Province.

Dreading the downfall of their protégés, US diplomats struck a deal with Belgium and Britain. As a result of this compact, the premiership was handed to their faithful servant, "strong man" Tshombe. The United States lost no time in plying him with arms. On November 24, 1964, US planes delivered Belgian paratroopers to Stanleyville from Ascension Island, a British colony, who, together with Tshombe mercenaries, seized the city and butchered the population.

Speaking the mind of the African people, Tanzania's Foreign Minister declared that "the Stanleyville operation will go down in history as the foulest, entirely unjustified and provocative intervention ever made by the Western world in the affairs and problems of the African continent". The governments of Guinea, Ethiopia, the United Arab Republic, Dahomey, Kenya and other African countries demanded an immediate stop to the intervention. Their stand was backed by the Soviet Union. On November 22, 1964, two days before the Stanleyville landing, TASS published a statement exposing the imperialist designs and emphasising that the Congolese, like the other peoples of Africa, must be given a chance to settle their own affairs and build an independent national state. On November 25, the Soviet Union described the capture of Stanleyville as "a new and violent act of armed interference". Pointing to the total groundlessness of the excuse that the operation was intended to "protect foreigners", the Soviet Government demanded an instant stop to the military intervention and called for the immediate withdrawal from the Congo of all Belgian troops and foreign mercenaries.

Despite the desperate dodges of the colonialists, the Security Council ruled that interference in the domestic affairs of the Congo was intolerable and that foreign mercenaries were to be evacuated from that country.

The peace-loving forces frustrated the designs of the United States and its allies to consolidate the Tshombe

regime by an act of armed diversion and thereby squash the liberation struggle in the Congo. The imperialists were compelled to abandon the planned landing of fresh troops and to recall the Belgian paratroopers. The troops of the Leopoldville Congo National Liberation Council liberated many of the towns seized earlier by the reactionaries in the Stanleyville operation, and by the beginning of 1965 controlled an area of 800,000 sq. kilometres with a population of seven million. The Leopoldville clique, in its impotent fury, undertook provocations against neighbouring states, as well as against the Soviet Union. It arrested N. P. Khokhlov, an *Izvestia* correspondent, and held him in prison unlawfully for over a month. The Soviet journalist was released after the Soviet Government and world opinion protested vigorously.

The Congo tragedy is the direct outcome of collective interference by the imperialist powers, who took advantage of the UN machinery to screen their purposes. Their behaviour has done a lot to dispell the illusions nourished by some of the African leaders about the policy of the Western powers. It has done a lot to open the eyes of the peoples to the fact that "new" colonialism was just as merciless and cruel as the old, no matter what garb is donned.

Soviet Attitude to African Unity

The Western powers provoke clashes and conflicts between the African countries to subvert their independence. The young states counter this imperialist line with inter-African unity, inaugurated in 1958 when eight independent African countries held a conference in Accra, the capital of Ghana. They convened on three occasions before 1960. The African leaders proclaimed that the co-operation of their countries is based on the desire to abolish colonialism, consolidate national independence and secure lasting peace. They flayed all colonialist manoeuvres and denounced the racial discrimination rampant in the South African Republic.

Meeting in Casablanca in 1961, a group of African states¹

¹ Ghana, Guinea, Lybia, Mali, Morocco, the United Arab Republic, the Provisional Government of Algeria and an observer from the Lumumba government (Congo).

reaffirmed its anti-imperialist attitude with respect to key African issues and declared its determination to combat neo-colonialism and cement unity through joint promotion of peace and non-participation in blocs.

The Western powers obstructed African unity in every possible way. In 1961, French efforts brought about the establishment of the Afro-Malagasi Union, consisting of 12 former French colonies. These formed the nucleus at a conference in Monrovia (Liberia) in 1961, which claimed that the sovereignty of some African countries was being threatened by others, and made no mention of the imperialist threat to Africa. The conference advocated non-interference in conflicts such as that raging in Algeria. It recommended settling disputes with the colonial powers through the United Nations, thus gravitating towards reconciliation with colonialism. The Monrovia decisions were hailed by the West and used by it against the Casablanca resolutions.

However, the bald attempt to split Africa into opposed political groups was repulsed by the independent governments and the public throughout the African continent. A Summit Conference of Independent African States convened in Addis Ababa (Ethiopia) on May 22-25, 1963. The conference confirmed that the purpose of inter-African co-operation was to "safeguard and consolidate the hard-won independence as well as the sovereignty and territorial integrity of our states, and to fight against neo-colonialism in all its forms".

The African Heads of Government and State founded the Organisation of African Unity (OAU), designed to co-ordinate activities in the political, diplomatic and economic spheres and in transport, communications, education, culture, defence and security. The work of the OAU is controlled by the Council of Foreign Ministers of its member-countries. A number of other bodies has been established, including the Co-ordinating Committee for the Liberation of Africa, to combat Portuguese rules in Angola, Mozambique and "Portuguese" Guinea, and the apartheid policy of the South African Republic.

In 1963-65, OAU organised a boycott of Portugal and the South African Republic, helped to settle border conflicts incited by imperialists between some African coun-

tries, and came out strongly against imperialist interference in the Congo.

The Western powers wished nothing better than to blow up the OAU and to oppose the Afro-Malagasi group to countries that stuck consistently to the policy of non-alignment.

The Soviet Union, which always favours solidarity in the struggle against imperialism, views the idea of African unity with deep understanding. Time and again it has called on the African countries to withstand imperialist provocations. In 1964, a Soviet appeal to Ethiopia and Somali facilitated an accord between them on terminating border clashes. The friendly support of Soviet diplomats expedited UN approval of a number of recommendations put forward by the Organisation of African Unity. The Soviet attitude adds to the determination of the African peoples to repulse imperialist attempts at sowing discord between countries of the continent and obstructing their co-operation in the name of peace and independence.

Soviet Political Co-operation with the African States

The Soviet Union wishes to develop the friendliest of relations with the new African states.

Between 1955 and 1965, the USSR established diplomatic relations with 27 African countries. In some cases, the imperialists use their protégés to hinder the development of contacts between some of the newly independent countries and the Soviet Union. But their plan of isolating Africa from the socialist countries has collapsed.

Identity of interests in the struggle for peace and the independence of oppressed peoples furthers co-operation between the Soviet Union and the African countries in many international issues. Co-operation has been particularly fruitful with the neutralist countries, such as the United Arab Republic, Mali, Guinea, Ethiopia, Sudan, Somali, Kenya, Algeria, Morocco, etc. Among other things, Soviet friendship with these countries is highlighted by personal contacts between their statesmen. In 1958-65, the Soviet Union was visited by the Presidents of the United

Arab Republic, Algeria, Ghana, Guinea and Mali, the Emperor of Ethiopia, the Prime Ministers of Sudan, Somali, Senegal and Uganda and by government delegations of Nigeria, Tunisia, Kenya and Tanzania. For their part, top Soviet statesmen paid visits to Ghana, Guinea, Morocco, the United Arab Republic and Sudan. Soviet Government delegations have also visited many other African countries.

The African statesmen were warmly received in the Soviet Union and saw every evidence of the deep-going sympathy and goodwill of the Soviet people. The population and leaders of the African countries, too, greeted Soviet visitors with immense enthusiasm.

Documents issued on the talks proclaim Soviet solidarity with the peoples of Africa fighting for independence, indict colonialist atrocities and demand independence for all colonies. The Soviet Union works hand in hand with the African countries to achieve the prohibition of racial discrimination in the South African Republic.

It supports African proposals concerning measures to safeguard peace and turn the continent into a denuclearised zone without foreign military bases.

The leaders of the African countries, for their part, hail the Soviet proposals for the abolition of colonialism, the strengthening of peace and security and the accommodation of controversies by peaceful negotiation.

The Soviet Union works hard for the consolidation of the international positions of the young African states, for their admission to the United Nations, and strives to have their opinion reckoned with in the solution of key world problems.

Soviet Economic Ties with the African Countries

In its efforts to retain control over the young African states, the West capitalises on their backwardness and their dependence on foreign monopolies. In the circumstances, mutually advantageous economic relations between the developing countries, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union and the other socialist states, on the other, are doubly important. The people of the Soviet Union consider it their

internationalist duty to help Africans consolidate their independence.

As we have said earlier, the Soviet Union co-operates with the United Arab Republic in building the High Aswan Dam and in laying the foundations of industry in this, one of the biggest, North African countries.

On July 11, 1959, the Soviet Union concluded an agreement on economic and technical co-operation with Ethiopia. The USSR granted Ethiopia long-term credits for research and for the equipment of an oil refinery, a gold mine with a dressing factory, and for investigating the possibilities of building an iron and steel plant.

A similar agreement was concluded between the Soviet Union and Guinea on August 24, 1959. Under this agreement the Soviet Government granted credits for economic and technical assistance in the building of a number of industrial enterprises, and in developing agriculture and road-building. The Soviet Union helped Guinea build a cement factory, saw mill, cannery, shoe factory, refrigeration plant, polytechnical institute for 1,500 students, radio station, and stadium with a seating capacity of 25,000. Also, the Soviet Union reconstructed the airfield at Conakri and worked on a number of other projects. Some of these have already been started up. The Soviet-Guinean communique of February 15, 1961, issued during Leonid Brezhnev's visit to Guinea, emphasised "the benefits of Soviet-Guinean co-operation in the economic, scientific and technical fields, which is furthering economic progress in Guinea". The parties pledged to continue such co-operation.

The Soviet Union is also helping the Republic of Mali in prospecting for oil, gold, diamonds, etc., building a cement factory, a stadium and an educational centre, and in training national personnel, etc. In 1963-64, important economic and technical co-operation agreements were concluded between the Soviet Union and Algeria. The Soviet Government granted the Algerian People's Democratic Republic long-term credit on easy terms for the building of industrial enterprises and developing agriculture and transport. In 1964, the Soviet Union and Kenya agreed to co-operate in the construction of a textile factory, fish cannery, saw mill, sugar refinery, and other projects. The Soviet Union also maintains economic and technical

co-operation with Somali, Sudan, Tunisia, Tanzania and other countries. All in all, more than 250 industrial and other projects are being built in Africa with Soviet help.

The young African states are experiencing immense difficulties in training national personnel, for 85 per cent of their population is illiterate as an aftermath of colonial rule. In this matter, too, the Soviet Union is rendering them effective help. As far back as 1955, the Soviet Government instituted special scholarships for students from African trust territories. However, the trustee powers did not allow Africans to go to the Soviet Union to study. After independence, many African countries welcomed the chance of sending their citizens to learn in the USSR. Students from more than 20 African countries are getting an education in Soviet higher educational establishments. Soviet scientists and lecturers have gone to many African countries, where they are helping to build up educational establishments and centres. The training of skilled workers and technicians also proceeds at the industrial enterprises built with Soviet co-operation. In this manner, the Soviet Union is helping to solve one of Africa's most acute problems.

Mutually advantageous trade relations are gaining prominence. Trade with the Soviet Union is an important factor in combating imperialist economic diktat. The Soviet Union supplies first-class equipment and buys traditional items of export, thus reducing the dependence of African countries on the capitalist market. As a result, the Western powers are deprived of a chance to saddle economically underdeveloped countries with unequal trade agreements. Through the help of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries young African states are able to invigorate their economies and combat exploitation of their peoples by the imperialists. For its part, the Soviet Union buys raw materials and farm products from Africa.

Cultural relations between the USSR and Africa are expanding steadily. The Soviet Union has concluded cultural co-operation agreements with Guinea, Mali, Somali, etc. Soviet performers visit many regions of the continent, while Africans frequently perform in the USSR. The contacts between public, scientific, sports and other organisations of the Soviet Union and the African countries are growing stronger.

Although relations between the Soviet Union and most of the African countries were established only a few years ago, the mutual benefits of their political, economic and cultural links are patently evident.

Soviet-African friendship has become an important factor of peace. It helps to frustrate colonialist intrigues against the peoples of Africa, and its effects are sure to increase.

Conference of Non-Aligned Countries

The emergence of new independent states stimulated the co-operation of Asian and African countries on the world scene. In September 1961, a conference of 24 non-aligned countries took place in Belgrade.¹ Invitations were sent to neutralist countries favouring the principle of non-participation in military alliances. The documents adopted at the Conference (Declaration on the Danger of War and the Appeal for Peace, Declaration of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries) appealed for the settlement of problems creating international tension by means of negotiation. The conferees spoke out for general and complete disarmament and urged once again that the principles of peaceful coexistence be accepted as the basis of international relations. Also, they demanded the immediate, complete and final abolition of colonialism in all its forms.

Elimination of the economic backwardness of countries that had flung off the colonial yoke, and general assistance to them, was proclaimed as one of the most important international tasks. The heads of the delegations of non-aligned countries called on the Soviet Union and the United States to hold direct negotiations designed to relieve international tension. The Soviet Government expressed its satisfaction that the neutralist states, whose population constitutes one-third of mankind, raised their

¹ Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, the Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, the Lebanon, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Somali, Sudan, Tunisia, Yemen, the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia.

voice in behalf of peace and firmly denounced the policy of war preparation. The USSR would continue to do its utmost for the peoples to gain an opportunity of living without fear of war, in peace and prosperity.

In October 1964, delegates of 47 non-aligned countries gathered at a second conference in Cairo.¹ The refusal to admit Tshombe, Prime Minister of the Congo (Leopoldville), to the conference for being an agent of the colonialists developed into a striking anti-imperialist demonstration. The Conference adopted a Programme for Peace and International Co-operation, which envisaged agreed action to liberate the still dependent countries and to wipe out colonialism, neo-colonialism and imperialism. The Conference advocated the granting of financial and military assistance to the fighters for the independence of the Portuguese colonies, declared its non-recognition of the racist government of Southern Rhodesia if such a government were formed, and approved a number of other specific recommendations. The non-aligned states called on all governments to follow the principles of peaceful coexistence, to refrain from the use of force in settling international controversies, and qualified as intolerable the existence of military bases in foreign territories.

In defiance of imperialist intrigues, the Conference again demonstrated the determination of the Asian and African countries, whose delegations constituted the overwhelming majority, to promote enduring peace.

The Soviet Government welcomed the results of the Conference. A joint Soviet-Cuban communique on October 19, 1964, underscored the international impact of the Cairo Conference and voiced the hope that its decisions would facilitate the unification of forces fighting against imperialism and contribute to a relaxation of tension and to a peaceful adjustment of pressing world problems.

¹ The countries which attended the 1961 Conference, save the Congo (Leopoldville), were joined at this conference by Algeria, Angola, Burundi, the Cameroons, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Congo (Brazzaville), Dahomey, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Liberia, Lybia, Malawi, Mauritania, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra-Leone, Syria, Togo, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia. Observers were sent to the conference by Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Finland, Jamaica, Mexico, Trinidad-Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.

The Soviet Government showed its understanding of the desire to convene a second conference of Asian and African states. The USSR, whose territory occupies nearly two-fifths of Asia, has every reason to participate in this conference. It is natural, therefore, that a number of countries spoke out in favour of inviting the Soviet Union to the conference.

For its part, the Soviet Government announced that it supported the anti-imperialist aims of the conference wholeheartedly and would, as before, promote Afro-Asian solidarity and wage an irreconcilable struggle against colonialism, regardless of whether or not it participates in any future conferences.

CHAPTER V

**THE SOVIET UNION
AND THE LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES**

**National Liberation Struggle
of Latin American Peoples**

Latin America with its population of more than 200 million has become a scene of active anti-imperialist and anti-colonial struggle in the new, third stage of the general crisis of capitalism. Latin Americans are stepping forward with mounting resolve against the domination of foreign monopolies and the corrupt reactionary and dictatorial regimes, for complete national liberation. The struggle is aimed against the North American imperialists, who are plundering the continent's natural wealth and mercilessly exploiting millions upon millions of workers and peasants in Latin America.

This popular effort, which is part and parcel of the contemporary national liberation movement, is highlighted by the victory of the people's revolution in Cuba. This small country situated in the immediate proximity of the United States, the most powerful of the imperialist states, wrote finis to the dictatorial Batista regime and ended the power of the latifundists and the protégés of the US monopolists.

The heroic people of Cuba have carried through radical socio-economic reforms. An agrarian reform law was passed, state farms and agricultural co-operatives were set up, and enterprises, banks, insurance companies, transport and communications belonging to US monopolists, were nationalised. The revolutionary government has made a start in industrialising the country. Factories, power sta-

tions, and the like, are being built with the help of the Soviet Union and other socialist states. Groups of teachers have mounted an offensive against illiteracy.

The Cubans are defending their revolutionary gains from US imperialist encroachments with unshakable determination. Their courageous struggle for freedom and social progress is a beacon lighting the way to genuine independence and social progress for the other peoples of Latin America. "The victory of the Cuban revolution," says the 1960 Statement of Communist and Workers' Parties, "has powerfully stimulated the struggle of the Latin American peoples for complete national independence."¹ The Republic of Cuba is the first country on the American continent to be building socialism.

In the early sixties, a far-flung anti-imperialist movement developed in Brazil, the biggest of the Latin American countries. Frightened by the mounting revolutionary crisis, reactionaries organised an anti-popular conspiracy in August 1961. Three million working people responded with a general strike. The conspirators had had to retreat. A new government was formed, which set out to extend and consolidate the state sector in the nation's economy, safeguard national wealth from foreign plunder and invigorate the independent course in foreign policy. A law was passed restricting (to not more than ten per cent) the remittance abroad of profits on foreign investments. Strict control was instituted over the influx of foreign capital. In early 1964, President Joao Goulart signed decrees establishing a state monopoly in imports of oil and oil products, nationalising oil refineries and nationalising and distributing among the peasants uncultivated land within a ten-kilometre zone along state-operated railways and motor roads. Irrigation schemes were also instituted.

However, these measures, though conceived in a capitalist spirit, contradicted the interests of the big landowners and militarists. Furthermore, Goulart's policies outraged Washington. The US monopolists made up their minds to oust the unaccommodating Brazilian President. On April 1, 1964, a coup d'état was staged in the country.

¹ *The Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism*, p. 61.

Repressions were showered upon the workers and peasants, progressive intellectuals, Communists, Socialists, and upon many of the political and public leaders of the country. On the pretext of struggle against communism, the reactionaries set out to abolish most of the changes planned and partially effected by the Goulart government.

For all this, recent events have shown that if all the progressive forces join hands, the people can achieve telling success in the struggle against foreign monopolies. Mexico, with the second biggest population in Latin America, is also fighting for more complete political and economic independence. The *United States News and World Report* admits that Mexico's striving for complete independence is probably the main element of its relations with the United States. Measures are being taken against the abuses of foreign capital. The state sector in the economy is being expanded. The government controls oil mining, 75 per cent of the electric power output, 40 per cent of the steel and 87 per cent of the fertiliser output, etc.

Mexico has spoken out in favour of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, laying stress above all on its right to develop relations with socialist countries despite US objections. In the 18-Nation Disarmament Committee Mexico's spokesmen are working articulately for the conclusion of a general and complete disarmament treaty. The Mexican Government has proposed that Latin America be proclaimed a nuclear-free zone. It opposes Washington's attempts to involve Latin American countries in anti-Cuban actions and objects to the use of the Organisation of American States as a tool of US imperialist policy.

The peace-loving foreign policy of the Mexican Government has the support of the people.

In Venezuela, the people are striving to abolish foreign monopoly dominance and achieve economic independence, to defend their democratic rights, and combat the anti-popular policies of the ruling class. Although the country has generous natural conditions, most of the eight million Venezuelans are dragging out a miserable existence. Powerful monopolies are plundering its chief wealth—petroleum. In 50 years, more than \$50,000 million worth

of oil has been extracted in the country. But all this money settled in Wall Street and City coffers. Foreign companies derive an annual 30-40 per cent profit on invested capital, while Venezuela has to be content with mere crumbs.

In January 1958, a general strike that developed into an armed uprising put an end to the Marcos Perez Yiménez dictatorship, which the United States had considered totally dependable. In 1962, when it dawned on the people that Romulo Betancourt's US-sponsored terrorist regime had closed all paths to peaceful struggle for progress and national freedom, a partisan movement broke out in the country. The authorities employ inhuman reprisals to break the will and fighting spirit of the patriots. On April 1, 1965, for example, the government issued orders to fire on a peaceful demonstration. Political manifestations swept the country in protest. The government moved to ban opposition organisations and newspapers, whose leaders it promptly arrested. But the progressives are striking back.

Despite generous help from North American monopolies, reactionary Latin American regimes are unable to contain the peoples' craving for progress and democracy. The fascist Rojas Pinilla regime in Colombia fell in May 1957 after a series of strikes and demonstrations. An armed uprising flared up in Paraguay against the reactionary Alfredo Stroessner dictatorship in December 1959. Dictator Trujillo resigned under pressure of the Dominican people in May 1961.

The Panamanians responded with mass manifestations to the bloodbath staged by North American troops, in which several hundred people were killed and wounded in January 1964. The Government of Panama was compelled to break off diplomatic relations with the United States. The Panamanians demanded revision and repeal of the unequal agreements concerning the Panama Canal. They wanted sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone, which is occupied by US armed forces. Washington had had to agree to negotiate. But to avoid a discussion of the return of the Canal Zone to Panama, US diplomats resorted to legal sleight-of-hand. Blackmail, coupled with political and economic intimidation, was employed. The US monopolists dread losing their strategic hold on the Panama

isthmus and the annual \$54 million profit yielded by the Panama Canal Company.

When the Panamanian Government agreed to make concessions to the United States, the people organised mass demonstrations, carrying slogans, "Yankees go home!" and "The Panama Canal Must Belong to Panamanians!" The National Assembly passed a resolution reflecting the demands of the people. The patriots of Panama are carrying on the fight for their country's sovereignty.

The peoples of the British and French colonies in the Caribbean Sea also stepped up their struggles. Jamaica was the first to win political independence. In a referendum (September 1961), the majority voted for withdrawal from the West Indies Federation founded by British colonial authorities in 1958. Britain was compelled to consent to Jamaican sovereignty. In August 1962, the peoples of Trinidad and Tobago won their freedom and formed a united state. True to its policy of friendly assistance to peoples fighting for their freedom, the Soviet Union recognised the young states and supported their request for admission to the United Nations, whose members they became in September 1962.

The national liberation movement assumed a spectacular scale in British Guiana. The People's Progressive Party headed by Cheddi Jagan proclaimed as its main purpose the attainment of political independence. Since 1953, when Britain had had to "grant" Guiana a constitution, the People's Progressive Party won overwhelming victories in three elections, those of 1953, 1957 and 1961. Jagan's government which came to power published a programme aimed at the early attainment of complete sovereignty and a set of broad socio-economic reforms. It announced that it would carry through a policy of non-alignment and establish business relations with the socialist countries.

This programme encountered strong objections on the part of Britain and the United States, who joined their efforts to overthrow the Jagan government. The British colonialists used troops for this purpose, while the US imperialists flooded British Guiana with agents. Delaying independence under various pretexts, Britain imposed new elections on the country in December 1964. Despite

colonialist intrigues, the People's Progressive Party polled 45.8 per cent of the votes. But Britain and the United States formed a government of their own protégés. The people of British Guiana responded by stepping up the struggle against the domination of the old and new colonialists.

The peoples of Martinique, Guadeloupe and French Guiana have taken a stand against the French colonialists. The struggle for national independence is also running high in the US colony of Puerto Rico, which the Pentagon has studded with numerous naval and air bases.

The craving for unity of the patriotic forces is the highlight of the present stage of the liberation movement in the Latin American continent. The workers, peasants and progressive intellectuals, joined by a part of the bourgeoisie, are building up broad political organisations.

A national patriotic union emerged in Chile as far back as 1956. The revolutionary Popular Action Front consisted of the Communist and Socialist parties and other progressive organisations. Its influence grew steadily. It gained an impressive victory in the partial elections to the Parliament in March 1964 and in 1965, and controls about one-third of the seats in the National Congress. Its programme provides for the nationalisation of foreign mining enterprises, banks and foreign trade; protection of oil resources; industrial development and an agrarian reform; expansion of democratic freedoms and implementation of progressive social measures. In the field of foreign policy the Front stands for universal disarmament and the banning of nuclear tests, respect of the right of peoples to self-determination and for closer relations with the socialist and other countries.

In Mexico, the progressive organisations have formed an Election Front. This Front is working for the further consolidation of Mexico's economic and political independence. A national liberation front is active in Venezuela, Guatemala has a Revolutionary Patriotic Front, a United Front of Revolutionary Action exists in El Salvador, etc.

These political unions operate in their own countries, and also participate in actions on a continental scale.

The Latin American Conference for National Sovereignty, Economic Emancipation and Peace, held in Mexico

in March 1961, had great political impact. Prominent leaders of all the Latin American countries participated. The conference was sponsored by Lazaro Cárdenas, ex-President of Mexico. Its resolution reflected the main trends of the progressive struggle in Latin America. A Latin American Congress of Solidarity with Cuba was held in Brazil in late March 1963. "We appeal for vigilance and continuous action," said its message to the Latin American people, "in order to safeguard the sovereignty of Cuba. By so doing, we shall create the most favourable conditions for our own victory."¹

The Congress passed a resolution on invigorating and co-ordinating the Cuban solidarity movement.

The role of the working class in the national liberation movement is increasing steadily. Between 1949 and 1951 inclusive, a yearly average of 2,600,000 workers were involved in strikes in Latin America, while in 1964, the figure mounted to nearly 25,000,000. Powerful strikes took place in Uruguay, Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia and Venezuela.

The workers' actions are not purely economic in complexion. Their nature is distinctly political. On three occasions, the Brazilian proletariat held general strikes when reactionaries attempted to seize power, and the miners of Bolivia are fighting gallantly against the pro-American military junta.

A wave of general strikes swept Argentina at the close of 1964 and early in 1965. The working people struck for their trade union rights and higher wages. Under popular pressure, the parliament repealed laws banning the Communist Party and other progressive organisations.

All the same, the working-class struggle in Latin America is empaired by conciliators and opportunist elements, who are particularly numerous in the trade union organisations. They hold posts of prominence in the trade unions of many Latin American countries and are inclined to strike deals with the big local and foreign bourgeoisie, injecting division into the labour movement.

The peasant movement is becoming more massive and organised, and it should be borne in mind that a big sec-

¹ *Pravda*, Apr. 1, 1963.

tion of the Latin American population is rural. More than half of the 60 million gainfully employed Latin Americans subsist on farming.

The peasants are fighting against foreign and local monopolies, for an agrarian reform, in defence of democratic freedoms and national sovereignty. Armed resistance was offered when latifundists in Colombia began seizing peasant land with the help of terrorist bands, police and, later, the army. Partisans founded "independent republics" in various corners of the land. In May 1964, 16,000 soldiers specially trained for "anti-partisan warfare" and equipped with US weapons, launched Operation Marquetalia (named after the biggest partisan centre), but the punitive expedition fell through. The partisan movement is going from strength to strength. The 30th Plenary Meeting of the CC of the Communist Party of Colombia noted that "a new stage of the popular struggle, partisan in character, has begun... It will be a long struggle and final victory depends on its co-ordination with all other forms of mass struggle."

The Communist Parties stand in the van of the anti-imperialist liberation struggle. Their influence on Latin America's political life is mounting continuously. There are Communist Parties in all the Latin American countries. Their membership totals some 300 thousand. The biggest parties are those of Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela and Chile. Many parties, however, have to operate underground.

The big bourgeoisie connected with the North American monopolies, the latifundists, the more reactionary section of militarists (known in Latin America as gorillas) and the clericals, are waging an undisguised and ferocious war against the national liberation movement and the Latin American peoples. The national bourgeoisie, which dreads the growing struggle for liberation and the social demands of the people, is hesitant and uncertain in carrying through measures designed to win economic and full political independence. The bourgeois and petty-bourgeois political parties, alignments and groups, joined in some countries by trade union leaders, follow a line of conciliation. Yet, despite all difficulties, the national liberation struggle of Latin American peoples is steadily expanding.

Contacts have been established since the early 60s between the national liberation movements of Latin America and other continents. Latin Americans take part in the Afro-Asian solidarity meets. The idea of three continent solidarity (that of Asia, Africa and Latin America), brought forward by the Cuban Republic, has gained popularity. In 1965, at the Second Conference of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Movement, held in Ghana, a decision was reached to hold a three continent solidarity conference in Cuba.

Many of the Latin American countries support the Asian and African states in their striving to achieve equal economic relations with capitalist countries and to put an end to the non-equivalent commodity exchange whereby the imperialist monopolies squeeze fabulous profits out of the developing countries.

At the 17th UN General Assembly the delegations of Asian, African and Latin American countries framed a joint memorandum concerning a world-wide trade and development conference.

Representatives of some of the Latin American countries attended the Second Conference of Non-Aligned Countries in Cairo as observers in October 1964.

The national liberation struggle of the Latin American peoples is proceeding in a difficult environment and has to contend with the bitter resistance of a strong adversary, the US imperialists.

US Expansionist Policy in Latin America

In face of the tempestuously growing national liberation movement and the collapse of colonialism, the United States is resorting to subtler methods of retaining the Latin American countries under its undivided sway.

The US monopolies still hold the commanding heights in the economies of the Latin American countries. In 1963, North American investments totalled \$16,961 million, of which nearly \$10,000 million were direct investments.

The US monopolists are draining the economy, plundering national resources and mercilessly exploiting the

working people of Latin America. In the first fifteen post-war years profit and interest on North American capital added up to nearly \$10,000 million. In 1964, the declared profits alone, reaped by the various companies and the Government of the United States, reached the \$2,000 million mark.

As a result, the annual income per head of population in the Latin American countries is appallingly low—less than \$100 in Bolivia and Haiti, between \$100 and \$200 in Brazil, Paraguay, Peru, Colombia, Ecuador, Honduras, Nicaragua and Guatemala, etc. These, mind you, are average figures. In the north-eastern section of Brazil, for example, millions of people exist on an income considerably below \$100.

The abuses of the US monopolies lead to a perverse, lopsided development of the Latin American economy, which is built entirely on the export of one or two different raw materials. Take the following figures. In the past few years 80 per cent of Latin American exports consisted of just 20 raw materials and farm crops. Oil constituted 87 per cent of Venezuela's total export, coffee 57 per cent of Brazil's, copper 69 per cent of Chile's, and wool and beef 74 per cent of Uruguay's. Nearly half this export went to the United States.

This economic bondage leads inevitably to mounting financial difficulties. In 1960, the total foreign debt was \$5,500 million, a tidy sum that kept climbing until it reached the \$9,100 million mark in 1964.

Dependence on the North American market is having a most destructive effect on Latin American economies. Price fluctuations, even of the smallest degree, bring dire consequences in their wake. Yet the price of raw materials keeps dropping, while the price of equipment and manufactured goods imported from the United States mounts. The profit derived by Wall Street monopolists in 1961 solely from the non-equivalence of the prices of raw materials and manufactured goods added up to the fantastic figure of \$1,500 million. In subsequent years, this figure was still greater.

The United States does not hesitate to interfere in internal Latin American affairs, setting up reactionary dictatorships and police regimes in the various Latin

American countries. For this purpose, the imperialists are pushing the militarisation of the American states, training officers for the Latin American armies and activating armed "special purpose" units to combat the liberation movement. The men heading the various military and police regimes are, naturally, trained in the United States.

To invigorate their control over the Latin American countries, the United States bludgeoned the Organisation of American States into passing a decision establishing an Inter-American Military Academy. The main purpose of the officers trained there is to fight "against communism" and defend the dictatorial regimes. The Academy is patterned on its NATO counterpart.

The "special purpose" combat units are activated at US war bases in the Panama Canal Zone and at Fort Bragg, North Carolina. According to US press reports, 12,000 Latin American soldiers and a considerable number of officers had received special training by mid-1963. In addition, 300 US experts trained another 3,500 servicemen in 63 groups scattered all over Latin America for punitive combat, and, what is more, took direct part in operations against the partisan movement and public demonstrations of discontent. In more recent years, the training of "special purpose" units has expanded. Counter-revolutionary Cuban émigrés have been enlisted in the units on a big scale, and participated in the armed US intervention in the Congo in October 1964.

The United States has imposed an inter-American mutual "defence" treaty on the countries of the continent (at Rio de Janeiro in 1947) and a spate of bilateral military agreements. What the United States wishes is to merge the OAS with NATO. A proposal to establish contact between the two alliances was made officially in early 1958 by the then NATO Secretary-General, Paul-Henri Spaak. Yet the majority of the Latin American countries made the OAS Council turn down the proposal in March 1958.

An Organisation of Central American States (ODECA) embracing Guatemala, Honduras, Costa Rica, Nicaragua and El Salvador, was founded in April 1965 under the auspices of the United States. The main purpose of ODECA, as conceived by the United States, is to bear down on the

national liberation movement. A Defence Council has been formed, which plans the activation of punitive forces.

At its own war bases in the Panama Canal Zone and Central America, the United States has hand-picked units trained and equipped to keep down the peoples of the countries concerned.

The Central Intelligence Agency of the United States is an active vehicle of the policies pursued by the US monopolists. It plants terrorists in various Latin American countries to organise assassinations of progressive leaders, raids on Communist Party and trade union premises, etc. The CIA also sets up terrorist organisations, like the Black Hand in Colombia, which make it their purpose to slay the leaders and active members of the progressive movement.

After the Cuban Revolution, the United States made struggle against Freedom Island the cornerstone of its Latin American policies. The North American imperialists are bent on isolating and squashing the Cuban Republic by economic and politico-military pressures. In 1961-62, the United States endeavoured to form an anti-Cuban military bloc of Caribbean countries.

Anti-Cuban measures were discussed at conferences of OAS Foreign Ministers in Santiago (August 1959), San Jose (August 1960), Punta del Este (January 1962) and Washington (October 1962), at the conference of finance and economy ministers in Punta del Este (August 1961) and at the meeting the US President had with presidents of the Central American states in San Jose (March 1963). The OAS conferences in 1964 and 1965 were also prominently devoted to aggressive plans against Cuba.

In January 1961, the United States broke off diplomatic and consular relations with the Cuban Republic and set to preparing an armed aggression against that country. The plan envisaged a landing of armed Cuban counter-revolutionaries, followed by the puppet Miró Cardona "government" formed in the United States on March 22, 1961.

The US militarists sponsored a series of crude provocations to create a pretext for the projected assault. US warships and aircraft invaded Cuba's territorial waters and air space. Arms were parachuted to counter-revolu-

tionaries from American planes. Warships bearing no identification marks bombarded industrial targets on the Cuban shore and then ran for shelter to the US war base at Guantanamo. American anti-Cuban propaganda was sharply intensified.

On April 15, 1961, US B-26 bombers with Cuban identification marks fired on airfields in Havana, Santiago de Cuba and San Antonio. A day later, armed detachments of Cuban émigrés, supported by US naval and air forces, were landed in Cuba's Bay of Pigs. The governments of Guatemala and Nicaragua helped zealously to prepare this piratical invasion.

The armed forces of the Cuban Republic dealt a crushing blow to the counter-revolutionary gangs. In less than 72 hours the interventionists were smashed. Most of them were taken prisoner. A considerable quantity of US-made arms and equipment was captured.

After the bandit invasion fell through, US diplomacy began making still more vigorous use of OAS as a political tool.

A conference of OAS foreign ministers was called on the initiative of the US State Department in January 1962 in the Uruguay holiday resort of Punta del Este. There, the United States saddled the conference with iniquitous and far-reaching anti-Cuban decisions. Yet the principal Latin American countries resisted these plans. The US delegation fell back on intimidation and blackmail. Some governments were promised considerable allocations, others were subjected to political pressure. As a result, the US imperialists managed to drag through a resolution on the "incompatibility" of Cuba's socio-political structure with the inter-American system. Washington hoped this resolution would serve as a "legal basis" for aggression against revolutionary Cuba.

The resolution to expel Cuba from the OAS was supported by countries ruled by pro-American dictators and reactionary leaders. Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, Chile, Bolivia and Ecuador, who represent 70 per cent of Latin America's population, opposed the resolution.

The expulsion of Cuba from the OAS was a gross violation of the OAS Charter. "No state or group of states,"

says its Article 15, "has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other state" and may not, according to Article 16, "use or encourage the use of coercive measures of an economic or political character in order to force the sovereign will of another state and obtain from it advantages of any kind."

The joint statement issued by the Socialist parties of Argentina and Chile concerning the Punta del Este conference stressed that it "in effect wished to condemn agrarian reform, the elimination of illiteracy, expropriation of foreign enterprises, abolition of professional armies and the anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist foreign policy".

After the Punta del Este conference, the US ruling quarters stepped up pressure on the Latin American governments, urging them to rupture diplomatic relations with Cuba. Various arm-twisting devices were put to use for this purpose, coupled with promises of lavish credits and loans.

In step with political measures, Washington redoubled its economic aggression against Cuba. The US President announced an embargo on trade with Cuba. In 1958, US-Cuban trade had amounted to \$1,074 million. By 1961, it had dwindled to \$50 million, and today has been practically reduced to nil.

After the US naval blockade of Cuba was announced on October 22, 1962, Washington summoned representatives of the Latin American countries to get their approval of the piratical scheme. The US delegation obtained their consent to employ against Cuba individual and collective sanctions, not short of armed force. This sort of decision was welcomed by the various Latin American dictators ruling their countries by grace of the United States imperialists. The reactionary regimes see eye to eye with Washington, because they fear the Latin American peoples will follow Cuba's example and establish popular rule in their countries.

In July 1964, an OAS session convened in Washington to adopt a decision that its members must rupture diplomatic relations with Cuba. Mexico refused to abide by it. The peoples, too, refused to submit. Mass demonstrations, meetings and strikes swept the Latin American capitals

in August and September 1964. At a mass meeting in Montevideo, Uruguay, a speaker said:

"The rupture will enslave not Cuba, but Uruguay. It jeopardises the sovereignty of all the states of the continent."

Numerous political and public leaders of varying political convictions are protesting against the OAS decision. The more far-sighted of Latin America's politicians cannot fail to see that decisions adopted under Washington pressure are aimed not only against Cuba, but against all the Latin American countries. Mexico's firm refusal to submit to US demands, is admired by the peoples of the continent.

Latin Americans are learning from experience that the OAS is an abettor of the aggressive policy of the US monopolies, and have nicknamed it the US Colonial Department. Contradictions and differences within the organisation are growing more acute.

The United States resorts on a big scale to plots and coups, which only speak of the instability of US-sponsored Latin American regimes. In just the three years of 1962-64 the imperialists and local reactionaries worked hand in hand to perform reactionary coups in Argentina, Peru, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, the Dominican Republic and Brazil.

The armed intervention against the Dominican Republic betokens North America's mounting aggressiveness in Latin America. On April 24, 1965, a group of democratically-minded officers of the Dominican army announced the reinstatement of President Juan Bosch, overthrown with US help in 1963. The people gave them unqualified support, clamouring for the restoration of the constitutional regime and for democratic freedoms. Washington, on the other hand, came out in support of the reactionary generals to prevent Bosch's return to power. But the patriotic forces crushed the reactionaries. So on April 28, the US President ordered a landing of American troops, who launched military operations against the Dominican patriots. This was an act of undisguised aggression against the people of a small country, one more attempt to maintain by armed force a dictatorial regime that acted on the wishes of the US monopolies.

The fresh US aggression created alarm and indignation in the Latin American countries. At a conference of the OAS Council convened by the US Government in Washington, Chile, Uruguay, Mexico, Peru, Ecuador, Venezuela and other countries protested against the piratical acts of the US militarists. Yet the United States managed to impose on them an OAS decision creating an Inter-American Force for shipment to the Dominican Republic in order to cloak the intervention with the OAS flag.

The Soviet Union protested vehemently against the arbitrary action of the US militarists in the Dominican Republic. The USSR demanded that the Security Council convene to condemn the aggressive conduct of the United States and take urgent measures to frustrate the intervention. At the Security Council, backed by the delegates of Cuba, and the neutralist Asian and African countries, the Soviet Union exposed the US attempts to escape responsibility and demonstrated that the aggression against the Dominican Republic was yet another link in the imperialist policy of the United States, which is dealing brutally with peoples that rise to fight for their freedom.

The US aggression against the Dominican Republic met with world-wide censure. The governments of the socialist countries and most Asian and African states declared their support of the Dominican people in no uncertain terms and demanded the withdrawal of US troops and a stop to interference in the country's internal affairs. On June 5, 1965, the Soviet Government published a statement calling on the Security Council and all UN member-countries to repulse US abuse and lawlessness and high-handed violations of the UN Charter.

The US-sponsored OAS decision to establish the so-called Inter-American Force, the statement pointed out, went against the UN Charter, which bears the signature of the United States. This decision is unlawful and constitutes a threat to the Latin American countries. Yet the US imperialists are bent on arrogating the right to interfere under the OAS flag in the internal affairs of the Latin American countries and to suppress governments and democratic forces working for the freedom and independence of their countries.

US Political Manoeuvres in Latin America. The Alliance for Progress

Despite the variety of economic and political pressures and armed interventions, the US monopolists are seeing their grip on Latin America slipping under the impact of the powerful national liberation movement. This is why Washington is forced to apply more flexible tactical dodges. In March 1961, it announced a programme, which it chose to name Alliance for Progress.

On White House orders, the US press, radio and television, and the propaganda vehicles of the dependent countries as well, extolled Alliance for Progress as the epitome of a coming Golden Age in Latin America. Yet its true purpose was to neutralise the influence of the Cuban revolution on the Latin American peoples, shore up the foothold of the US monopolists in Latin America, obscure the crying social injustices and contrasts, avert a revolutionary explosion and distract the peoples from the struggle for freedom.

The programme inferred that about \$100,000 million were needed to secure Latin America's economic upsurge in ten years. Of this sum, the Latin American countries were to provide \$80,000 million, the United States \$11,000 million, and the West European monopolies and Japan the remaining \$9,000 million.

A special inter-American economic conference to discuss the programme was convened in August 1961. It adopted the Charter of Punta del Este, which spoke speciously of the United States and the Latin American countries "joining efforts" in developing the latter.

The United States promised to allocate about \$1,000 million annually for the programme, which sum is considerably smaller than the profits derived annually by the US monopolies from their Latin American investments. It will be recalled that the US monopolies receive over \$2,000 million in profits from their investments and that, in addition, the United States also benefits from the non-equivalent prices. Moreover, the monopolists reap considerable profits from shipping and freight insurance. All in all, the United States pumps more than \$3,000 million out of Latin America every year.

Furthermore, the United States has hemmed in the financing of the Alliance for Progress with a profusion of economic and political strings. The bulk of the allocations are being made as loans and credits at the usual commercial interest of five or six per cent. These are to be put into industries operated by either the US monopolists themselves, or into local companies and trusts associated with the US monopolies. The recipients of the loans and credits undertake to spend the bulk of the money in the United States. What this boils down to is really a subsidy for US foreign commerce. Much of the allocations are to be spent on paying for the Food for Peace programme, which is no more than a sales promotion for US farm surpluses.

Before getting the dollars, the Latin American governments are obliged to submit their economic plans to Washington's scrutiny and approval, and to create favourable conditions for foreign investments, guarantee monopoly property, and the like.

As we see, the Alliance for Progress never visualised, nor could visualise, the industrialisation of the Latin American countries and the institution of radical agrarian reform. Economists estimate that even if the 10-year programme is carried out in full, the Latin American countries will still need some 100 years to attain the national income per head of population prevailing in the United States.

Yet the United States is in no hurry to dispense finances for this, albeit modest, programme. Instead of the promised \$1,000 million a year, the Latin American countries received this amount in the first two years, and not in dollars either, but mostly in US farm surpluses. In addition, the United States granted them a short deferment in paying up old debts. Part of the allocations were used urgently to cover acute budget deficits which, if the truth be told, were caused by abuses of the US monopolies.

The four years since the launching of the Alliance for Progress programme indicate clearly that it is much more a political, rather than economic, venture. The United States is using it to fight the Cuban revolution, to retain its grip on the continent, and to support dictatorial regimes.

The Alliance for Progress signboard is, in effect, a cover name for the alliance of US monopolists with the most unbridled, reactionaries, the latifundists and compradores, of Latin America. This, to quote Brazil's ex-President Juscelino Kubitschek, is the reason why Latin Americans are "indifferent and hostile to the Alliance for Progress".

The Alliance for Progress has failed to paralyse the revolutionary movement. In March 1963, a special committee of shareholders of US companies operating in Latin America called for a change in Alliance for Progress activities. What should be done, it said, is to stop talking about reform, reduce loans to state-operated enterprises in the Latin American countries and secure better conditions for the investment of private US capital. The US Government acted promptly on these demands and an exponent of firm dealing with Latin America was put at the head of the Alliance for Progress.

Inter-Imperialist Contradictions in Latin America

In the early post-war period the Latin American countries were still largely dominated by the US imperialists alone. But in the latter 1950s West European and Japanese businessmen began making bigger and bigger inroads into the Latin American economy. This whetted inter-imperialist contradictions and competitive rivalry. More foreign investments have been made in Latin America than anywhere else in the economically undeveloped regions of the world. The aggregate foreign capital operating in Latin America tops the \$20,000 million mark.

West European and Japanese monopolists are capitalising on the economic and, particularly, the political difficulties the United States experiences in Latin America to exploit the specific features of the area. The governments of the bigger Latin American countries, for example, who are pandering to the interests of the influential bourgeoisie, are taking steps to develop a versatile national economy, with an accent on industry. This has steeply increased the market for machines, lathes and other plant. Yet the Latin American countries are having trouble

selling their raw materials and farm crops, which, in turn, creates a foreign currency shortage. The Federal Republic of Germany, Japan and other rivals of the United States are making the most of this situation to conclude barter deals, importing manufactured goods in exchange for raw materials. Furthermore, they consent readily to building their own enterprises working on local raw and other materials. French Renault automobiles, for example, are assembled at the Mexican national enterprise, Diesel Nacional, out of 75 per cent local material.

The same is true of the English Austin automobiles assembled in Colombia.

Latin America attracts foreign capital by the prospect of extraordinarily high profits. The average rate of net profit on capital invested in Brazil, for example, is as high as 60 to 70 per cent, ranking among the highest in the world.

Unlike the United States, which keeps the bulk of its investments in the mining and oil industries, West European and Japanese industrialists lay the accent chiefly on the manufacturing industries—engineering, the automobile and chemical industries, and electrical engineering.

West German businessmen are particularly active. According to estimates of the West German Economic Institute, about 1,000 million West German marks were invested in Latin America in 1952-59, and another 248 million in 1961. By 1965, FRG investments there topped \$700 million, which is ten times the West German investments in Africa and Asia. Capital is exported by Krupp, IG-Farbenindustrie, Siemens, Mercedes-Benz, Volkswagen, Flick and Haniel.

Bent on expanding their bridgeheads, FRG concerns are designing and building a big number of large-scale industrial projects in Brazil, Chile, Argentina, Peru, Venezuela and El Salvador. Klöckner is building a steel mill in Brazil that is going to be the biggest in Latin America. Krupp is the principal supplier of diesel engines for Brazil's railways. In 1960, the West German firm of Ferrostahl concluded a deal with Acindar (Industria Argentina de Aceros) for the joint working of iron ore deposits in Patagonia. In March 1961, the Atomic Energy Council of Peru signed an agreement with the FRG Ministry of

Atomic Energy and Water Resources for the working of uranium deposits in the Vilcamba area. The FRG is also financing the modernisation of Bolivia's tin industry.

In 1964, FRG President Heinrich Lübke visited a number of Latin American countries. His junket was viewed by the West German monopolies as a prelude to further penetration. The *Handelsblatt*, mouthpiece of the Düsseldorf Stock Exchange, stressed that it "amounts to at last showing our teeth to our foreign competitors".

Other West European capitalists are reluctant to leave the palm to their West German counterparts. British, French and Italian monopolies are laying their hands on Brazil's economy. British and Dutch capital, amounting to as much as £530 million, is invested through Shell in Venezuela's oil industry.

In Argentina, British capital controls 560 large landed estates, numerous refrigeration plants, the Iron Company, the *Compañía británica de construcciones*, the *Talleres mecánicas y navales*, the chemical firms of Duperial and Electrocolor, and the textile mills of Alpargatas. British capital also controls as much as 60 per cent of the wood-working industry. Considerable British funds are invested in mining, transport and commerce. Britain accounts for something like 10 per cent of Latin America's foreign trade.

When Adolfo López Mateos, the President of Mexico, visited Paris in March 1963 and President Charles de Gaulle paid a return visit to Mexico in March of the following year, the two countries reached an understanding that France will take a hand in Mexico's economic development, particularly the development of her petro-chemical industry. A mixed committee was set up to frame the pertinent projects. France granted Mexico a loan of \$150,000,000. Paris is also conducting economic negotiations with a number of other Latin American countries.

Italian financiers, too, are turning their gaze on Latin America. A consortium of Italian banks has purchased 15,000 million liras worth of bonds from the Inter-American Development Bank. Italian monopolists are financing industrial construction in Argentina, Chile and Brazil.

Japan's direct investments in Latin America have increased considerably. In Brazil alone, they total \$250-300 million. About \$100 million is being put into the Usiminas iron and steel project.

The Mitsubishi Mining Company has established a daughter company in Chile to work iron ore deposits. The Nippon Mining Company is working copper mines in Antofagasta, and six Japanese firms have formed the Nippon Bolivia Mining Company in 1960 to extract copper ore in Bolivia.

Japan's trade with the Latin American countries accounts for nine per cent of the latter's foreign commerce. The inter-imperialist contradictions in Latin America became more acute after the establishment of the European Common Market. The United States has good grounds to fear that the West European capitalists will operate in concert in South and Central America to elbow out the US monopolists, who have heretofore held undivided sway.

As we see, the United States, who still holds the key positions in the economies of the various Latin American countries, is beginning to run into competition. The savage competitive struggle for markets and spheres of investment is already now exerting an influence on political developments and the alignment of forces in the Latin American countries. This has triggered attempts to put the penetration of West European and Japanese capital under US control. An Atlantic Community has been formed for this purpose, with the professed aim of "assisting" Latin America. One of its chairmen is Emilio G. Collado, vice-president of the mighty Standard Oil Company of New Jersey.

Soviet Union and the Latin American Countries

Soviet policy towards the Latin American countries is based on the desire to establish equal and mutually advantageous co-operation and help the peoples in their just struggle for genuine independence, progress and peace.

Despite the all-out efforts of imperialist propaganda to inject the venom of anti-communism into Latin Americans,

they consider the Soviet Union a true friend and champion of all oppressed peoples.

The Soviet Union is doing its utmost to invigorate relations with the Latin American countries. Soviet people consider it their internationalist duty to assist the national liberation struggles of the Latin Americans. In the United Nations and at other international forums, the Soviet Union invariably promotes the right of the peoples to decide their own fate, calling for an end to US expansionist policy and to the plunder of the wealth and the exploitation of the manpower of Latin America by foreign monopolies.

The successes of the socialist countries and the national liberation movement are pulling down the barriers erected by the imperialists and the reactionary bourgeois and latifundist elements to isolate Latin America from the socialist countries.

As stressed in the CC CPSU Report to the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, "Soviet relations with the Latin American countries ... have made progress despite the barriers artificially raised by internal reaction and the US imperialists. ... And even though the US imperialists stop at nothing—not even at overthrowing lawful governments—to prevent Latin American countries from pursuing an independent policy, events will nevertheless take their own course."

Friendly contacts have been established in the last few years between the Soviet Union and a number of Latin American countries. Even the ruling quarters still closely connected with the United States are beginning to gravitate more distinctly towards greater political, economic and cultural contacts with the Soviet Union, despite the strong resistance of the US imperialists.

The Soviet Union maintains normal diplomatic relations (through diplomatic missions) with the Republic of Cuba (May 1960)¹, Brazil (November 1961), Mexico (August 1924), Argentina (June 1946), Uruguay (August 1926), and Chile (1964). Formal diplomatic relations, exclusive of an exchange of missions, are maintained with Bolivia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic and

¹ See Chapter II.

Costa Rica. Diplomatic relations were broken off due to reactionary intrigues with Colombia (May 1948) and Venezuela (June 1952). However, the Soviet Union has never had diplomatic relations with Paraguay, Haiti, El Salvador, Honduras, Peru and Panama.

Relations with Brazil became perceptibly better in the early 60s. A three-year trade agreement was concluded in 1959. When Janio Quadros¹ was inaugurated President, the Soviet and Brazilian governments exchanged telegrams expressing their readiness to develop Soviet-Brazilian relations.

In the summer of 1961, a parliamentary delegation and a group of Brazilian journalists visited the Soviet Union. A Soviet goodwill mission paid a return visit to Brazil. Soviet journalists, too, made a tour of that country. Also in 1961, Yuri Gagarin, the world's first cosmonaut, visited Brazil on the invitation of her President.

In August 1961, Vice-President Joao Goulart came to Moscow. He exchanged opinions with Soviet statesmen concerning Soviet-Brazilian relations.

The mutual visits and exchanges of messages paved the way for a normalisation of relations. Soon after Goulart,² leader of the Labour Party, became Brazil's President, negotiations were launched for the resumption of diplomatic relations. They culminated on November 23, 1961, in an exchange of pertinent messages by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs. The resumption of Soviet-Brazilian relations was hailed with deep satisfaction by the peoples of both countries. The Soviet Government said in its message to Goulart in June 1962: "In sending our Ambassador to the United States of Brazil, the biggest country in Latin America, we are prompted by the desire to develop relations of friendship and co-operation with Brazil and to promote better mutual understanding between the Soviet and Brazilian peoples."³

¹ Quadros was President from January to August 1961. Under pressure of local reactionaries, connected with the United States, he was compelled to resign and leave the country.

² Goulart became President in September 1961 after an acute political struggle. Reaction, supported by the United States, attempted to block the patriotic statesman's ascent to power.

³ *Pravda*, June 17, 1962.

From 1961 to 1964 Soviet-Brazilian relations made good headway on the basis of friendship and mutually advantageous co-operation.

In May-June 1962, a Soviet trade and industry exhibition in Rio de Janeiro attracted considerable public notice. The Soviet Government delegation that came to its opening had talks with the President of Brazil, the Foreign Minister and other statesmen, and Brazilian businessmen. An understanding was reached to conclude a new long-term trade agreement,¹ and a trade protocol for 1962, envisaging a considerable increase in trade, was signed. Five-year agreements on trade and payments, and on mutual deliveries in 1963-65 were signed on April 20, 1963.

Soviet oil experts concluded after close on-the-spot explorations in 1963 that the country had oil deposits big enough to meet national needs. The Soviet specialists rejected the findings of US geologists that the oil industry in Brazil had no future.

However, after the coup d'état in Brazil in 1964, reactionary elements have been going out of their way to impair relations with the Soviet Union.

A certain improvement has occurred in the last few years in Soviet-Mexican relations. Contacts at various levels, exchanges of delegations, relations between parliaments and cultural co-operation have been getting more lively since 1958. Messages were exchanged by the Soviet Government and the President of Mexico on key international issues.

In 1958, the Soviet Union was visited by Lazaro Gardenas, ex-President and prominent Mexican political leader. Also in 1958, a Soviet Government delegation attended ceremonies at which Adolfo López Mateos was inaugurated President of Mexico.

More than a million Mexicans came to see the Exhibition of Soviet Technical and Scientific Achievement, held in the Mexican capital in 1959. A Soviet Government delegation headed by Anastas Mikoyan was present at the opening of the Exhibition.

¹ The 1959 agreement expired in 1962.

A Soviet Government delegation also attended the festivities marking the 150th anniversary of Mexico's independence in September 1960. The message of the Soviet Government on that occasion said the Soviet Union would do its utmost to promote good relations with Mexico, which not only accorded with the interests of the Soviet and Mexican peoples, but also contributed to the furtherance of peace. The message noted the identity of Soviet and Mexican views on such key matters as general and complete disarmament, abolition of colonialism and non-interference in the internal affairs of other states. In his reply, the Mexican President said Mexico would persevere in its efforts to promote constructive solutions for the disarmament problem and all other problems impeding international relations and co-operation.

In a message to the Soviet Government, the President of Mexico expressed his satisfaction over the adjustment of the Caribbean crisis in the autumn of 1962 and voiced the hope that redoubled efforts would be made to relieve tension and find acceptable solutions for problems still jeopardising peace.

In November 1962, the Mexican Congress appealed to the parliaments of the world to work for peace, general disarmament and a stop to nuclear bomb testing. The Supreme Soviet of the USSR hailed this initiative and said in the message that "securing dependable and lasting peace on earth, particularly now, when nuclear weapons have been developed, is the prime task of all countries and peoples". It underscored its unshakable determination to promote peace.

The exchange of parliamentary, cultural and scientific delegations between the Soviet Union and Mexico has expanded. This is promoting greater mutual understanding and common views on matters concerning the interests of both countries. The Mexican parliamentary delegation which visited the Soviet Union on the invitation of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR was given a warm reception by the Soviet people. A joint Soviet-Mexican communique stressed the mutual desire to develop versatile relations between the two countries and to consolidate peace and international security. The statement of the Supreme Soviet delegation which visited Mexico in 1964 noted that

the coinciding views on many important international problems formed a good basis for greater friendship and co-operation between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Mexico. A Soviet delegation attended the inauguration of President Gustavo Díaz Ordaz in late 1964.

Soviet-Mexican cultural relations, too, have expanded considerably.

After Arturo Frondizi became President of Argentina in May 1958, Soviet-Argentine relations became somewhat more lively. A Soviet Government delegation attended the President's inauguration. An agreement was concluded in October 1958, under which the Soviet Union granted Argentina long-term credit for \$100,000,000 to purchase Soviet equipment for her oil industry. In 1959, Soviet-Argentine trade aggregated as much as 40,200,000 rubles.

A Soviet Government delegation headed by Alexei Kosygin went to Argentina in May 1960 to attend festivities marking the 50th anniversary of the May Revolution. An additional credit protocol was concluded in Buenos Aires on May 27. It added to the list of commodities which Argentina could purchase on account in the USSR.

However, under the pressure of local militarists and the US imperialists, the Frondizi government began reducing contacts with the Soviet Union. The film exchange agreement was abrogated. The Argentine authorities took unfriendly actions against the Soviet Embassy in Buenos Aires, and refused to grant visas to Soviet citizens. Soviet offices in Buenos Aires were raided in April and May 1961. Moreover, the Frondizi government refused to receive a Soviet goodwill mission.

After the coup d'état in March 1962, when a mixed military and civilian dictatorship was in effect established in Argentina, relations with the Soviet Union became still more strained. Trade came to a near standstill, and in May 1962, the Argentine Government repealed the trade and payments agreement of 1958.

In July 1963, Arturo Illia was elected President of Argentina. In his election speeches he said, among other things, that he favoured greater co-operation with all countries. The USSR welcomed the intentions of the new Argentine President to expand international relations. The Soviet Government voiced its hope that relations of friend-

ship, mutual understanding and economic co-operation would develop between the USSR and Argentina.

Soviet-Uruguay relations also followed the line of commercial, cultural and sports exchanges and parliamentary contacts. The Uruguay Government that came to power in March 1963 showed a distinct interest in expanding trade with the Soviet Union. The diplomatic missions in Moscow and Montevideo were converted into embassies on a reciprocal basis in December 1964.

Soviet-Chilean relations have been normalised. Chilean members of parliament visited the USSR in November 1960, and a delegation of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR paid a return visit in 1961. A Chilean trade delegation came to Moscow in January 1960. A permanent Soviet trade mission was opened in Santiago. A large group of Chilean members of parliament again came to the USSR in June 1961 and was received by the Chairmen of the two chambers of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. Cultural relations became somewhat more lively.

In June 1963, an economic delegation headed by the Minister of Land, Julio Phillipi, visited the Soviet Union to negotiate economic and commercial matters. Eduardo Frei, leader of the Christian-Democratic Party of Chile, paid a visit to the Soviet Union in October 1963. The following year, a scientific exchange agreement was concluded in Santiago between Moscow University and University of Chile.

A big campaign for the resumption of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries gained momentum in Chile, and the revolutionary Popular Action Front, a major political organisation, came out for an early normalisation of relations with the USSR. But the Conservative and Liberal parties in power at the time obstructed the issue.

Resumption of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union became a focal issue during the elections in Chile on September 4, 1964. Salvador Allende, a presidential nominee of the People's Front of Progressive Forces, said he would, if elected, immediately restore diplomatic relations with the USSR and the other socialist countries. The election programme of the People's Front exerted a beneficial influence on the Christian-Democratic Party, which

supported the demand of the Chilean people. Eduardo Frei, candidate of the Christian-Democratic Party, who had the support of the Conservatives and Liberals, won the election.

After the election, Gabriel Valdes, Foreign Minister in Frei's cabinet, declared: "We shall keep our promise of establishing relations with all countries of interest to Chile, particularly the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and Poland."

The communique announcing the resumption of diplomatic relations between the USSR and Chile, and the establishment of embassies, was issued on November 24, 1964, in Santiago.

Soviet relations with Bolivia have also expanded.

Contacts were established between the National Congress of Bolivia and the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. Bolivian parliamentary delegations and chairmen of the chambers of the Bolivian Congress visited the Soviet Union in 1959-61 and in June 1963. Soviet parliamentary delegations went to Bolivia in late 1960 and September 1962.

A call is being sounded in Bolivian political quarters and the National Congress to exchange diplomatic missions with the USSR. The Congress has passed decisions repeatedly on the need to have a diplomatic mission in Moscow. But these decisions have not yet been put into practice.

The reactionary governments in some other Latin American countries that do the will of the United States, are obstructing cultural, as well as political and commercial, relations with the Soviet Union.

Good opportunities exist for mutually advantageous relations between the USSR and the Latin American countries. The Soviet policy of peace is appreciated more and more by the working people of Latin America. They call vigorously for friendly contacts with the USSR and the other socialist countries. Collaboration between the Soviet Union and the Latin American countries on a basis of peaceful coexistence and mutually advantageous co-operation will further the peace and benefit the nations concerned.

CHAPTER VI

USSR WORKS FOR THE SOLUTION OF VITAL INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS AND FOR ENDURING PEACE

SOVIET EFFORTS IN THE 1950s TO RELIEVE INTERNATIONAL TENSION AND GIVE A START TO GENERAL DISARMAMENT

The international situation of the late 40s and early 50s was extremely strained. The aggressiveness of the leading imperialist powers, especially after the United States started the Korean war, put mankind on the brink of a new world war. Western diplomacy stood pat in refusing to settle the German problem and was reluctant to conclude a State Treaty with Austria. The USA and its NATO partners sabotaged economic and other contacts with the socialist countries.

Acting on the Leninist principles of the peaceful coexistence of states with different socio-economic systems and leaning for support on its increasing economic power and on the fraternal backing of the socialist states, the Soviet Union mounted a vigorous campaign for an international détente and for normal relations and mutually advantageous co-operation among all nations, the great powers included. The USSR pressed for a rapid solution of such acute matters as general and complete disarmament, the banning of nuclear weapons tests, a German peace settlement, and the like.

USSR Suggests the Establishment of a System of Collective Security (1954)

One of the big reasons for the international tension in the period under review was the existence of such imperialist war blocs as the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation

(founded in 1949), the Western European Union (1954),¹ and others. Their founders described them as a "defensive measure" against the "communist peril". But this was no more than a smokescreen for efforts of the United States and its partners to step up the arms race and turn the countries neighbouring on the Soviet Union into strategic staging areas for aggression. Yet twentieth-century history, notably the origins of the First and Second World wars, shows that policies based on the grouping of opposed states lead to war.

This is why the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries did their utmost to prevent the splitting of the world into inimical military blocs. The problem loomed bigger than ever in 1954, when the stage was being set to admitting the Federal Republic of Germany into the North Atlantic Alliance. In February 1954, the Soviet Government suggested an all-European collective security agreement.

The project envisaged that all European countries, irrespective of their social system, sign the agreement, which was based on the principle of collective action against any and all threats of armed aggression in Europe. This implied that in the event of an attack on one or more of the signatories, all other signatories would be obliged to render help with all available means, not short of armed force.

Though keeping their armed forces, the signatories were to undertake not to attack any other signatory. Furthermore, they were not allowed to enter any coalitions or alliances, or to conclude agreements inconsistent with the aims of European collective security.

The Soviet project envisaged that prior to the conclusion of a German peace and the reunification of Germany, the two existing German states—the GDR and FRG—could both join the European collective security system.

The all-European agreement would have radically improved the situation in Europe, facilitated the adjustment of issues in dispute and paved the way for greater international trade and other contacts.

¹ A NATO affiliate in Europe. Formed under the Paris Agreements concluded in October 1954. Its members are Britain, France, the FRG, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg.

The Western ruling groups looked for good excuses to turn down the Soviet proposals. Some Western politicians said the project was intended to "isolate" the West European countries from the United States and thereby afford the Soviet Union an opportunity to dominate Europe. The opponents of collective security also claimed that the Soviet proposals were incompatible with the North Atlantic Treaty.

Eager to remove the obstacles to all-European security, the Soviet Government announced that it would not object to the admission of the United States to the all-European agreement. It was willing, too, it announced, to discuss its own entry into the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation and thus eliminate its aggressive sting.

The West declined to consider the Soviet proposals. What was more, the imperialists launched a series of provocative acts to deepen the split between the European states. The Paris Agreements, which provided for the remilitarisation of the FRG and its admission to the North Atlantic bloc, were concluded on October 23, 1954, laying bare the war-like designs of the imperialists and creating an explosive situation in Europe.

Before the Paris Agreements were ratified, the Soviet Government made yet another attempt to prevent Europe's division into opposite military groups and to achieve the establishment of a collective security system. The USSR proposed that all European states, the People's Republic of China and the United States of America hold a conference in Moscow or Paris.

The Western governments ignored the Soviet proposal. The conference, held in Moscow from November 29 to December 2, 1954, was attended by the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania and an observer from the People's Republic of China. The declaration issued by the conference said genuine security in Europe could not be achieved unless a system of collective security replaced the military alignments of European states. The conference approved the principles set out in the Soviet draft of the All-European Collective Security Treaty and called on all European governments to discuss the proposals of the USSR and the other socialist countries jointly. The mem-

bers of the conference declared themselves willing to examine all other proposals for European collective security in order to make it acceptable to all the countries concerned.

The declaration of the Moscow conference stressed that the Paris Agreements showed that the Western powers had abandoned the idea of a German peace settlement.

The members of the conference warned of the dangers arising from the ratification of the Paris Agreements and declared that they would be compelled to reinforce their own security and the European peace if these agreements were ratified.

The ratification of the Paris Agreements touched off a keen political battle in France, Britain and the FRG. Yet the reactionary forces in those three countries defied the will of their peoples and bludgeoned the parliaments into passing the agreements.

On May 5, 1955, the Paris Agreements entered into force. German militarism, which had touched off two world wars within the lifetime of one generation, again threatened the security of the peoples. The countries that had signed the Moscow declaration were forced, therefore, to take effective measures to reinforce their security. At a conference in Warsaw on May 14, they concluded a Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance,¹ which dependably guaranteed the security of the socialist countries of Europe. The Warsaw Treaty also serves the interests of consolidating universal peace.

USSR and the Disarmament Problem. May 10, 1955, Proposals

Disarmament is another problem that has gained special urgency in our time. Stopping the arms race, as the 20th Congress of the CPSU noted rightly, is one of the most vital matters of our time. The vast number of nuclear-rocket weapons stockpiled on our planet imperils the security of the whole world. The more zealous politicians in the United States and other countries party to aggres-

¹ See Chapter II.

sive blocs often declare their readiness to take "any risk", not short of a nuclear conflict, in order to press their aggressive plans.

The sharply aggressive policies of the United States, which acts as the world policeman, the escalation in Vietnam, where the US imperialists do not hesitate to employ napalm, poison gases and bombs against civilian populations, the armed invasion of the Dominican Republic by US troops, and countless other facts show how grim the danger has become. The possibility of an accidental outbreak of war should not be overlooked either. It is a stark fact that the possibility of an accident grows as the arms race continues.

General and complete disarmament, that is, the complete destruction of the material means of warfare, is the only valid guarantee of peace. Disarmament, to be sure, will not eliminate the social causes of wars, which are rooted in the aggressive aspirations of imperialism, but the reduction of the technical means of warfare would still greatly improve the general climate and restrict the possibilities of aggression.

Disarmament negotiations have been going on at intervals for several decades. Disarmament was discussed by the League of Nations long before the Second World War, and is now being dealt with by the United Nations and various committees and sub-committees. Yet the negotiations have yielded no practical results due to the recalcitrant attitude of the United States and the other Western powers. Today, it is true, the discussion ranges far beyond the diplomatic framework. A large section of the world population has joined the struggle for a solution of this most urgent problem. The peoples can, and must, compel the imperialists to stop the arms race by strong and determined action.

The Soviet Union stands in the van of the battle for disarmament. Lenin, the founder of the Soviet state, described disarmament as the ideal of socialism. The Soviet Union and all the other socialist countries do not need either arms or armies to build communism. They are compelled to maintain armies for protection against a possible foreign attack and to secure world peace. If the Western powers had given up their armed forces and ar-

maments, the disarmament problem would long have been settled and mankind freed from the peril of a nuclear conflict and the burden of military expenditure. The vast resources thus set free would have been concentrated on bettering the living standards of the nations.

The Western powers, it is true, give plenty of lip service to their willingness to abandon armaments, to their love of peace. Yet they doggedly sabotage disarmament. This applies first and foremost to the United States.

In December 1954, the imperialists agreed on equipping NATO forces with nuclear weapons and arming West Germany to an extent greater than earlier envisaged. The United States proclaimed the doctrine of "massive" atomic blow. The numerous nuclear weapons tests made by the United States caused grave apprehensions all over the world. In 1955, the arms race assumed disastrous proportions.

In the circumstances, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR felt it had to draw the attention of the peoples and parliaments of the world to the dangerous situation wrought by the conduct of the Western governments. Its declaration of February 9, 1955, urged a stop to the arms race and the banning of atomic and all other weapons of mass annihilation.

On February 18, the Soviet Government proposed that the countries concerned destroy their stockpiles of atomic and hydrogen weapons, refrain from increasing their armed forces, armaments and military allocations above the 1955 level, and convene a world conference for the universal reduction of arms and the banning of atomic weapons.

The Soviet proposals of May 10, 1955, prominent in the history of the disarmament negotiations, represent an exhaustive programme concerning both the reduction of conventional arms and the banning of atomic weapons. They envisage measures designed to eliminate the threat of a new war and to build up confidence between states.

To facilitate agreement, the Soviet Union bowed to some of the wishes of the Western powers. Back in 1952, countering a Soviet proposal to reduce armed forces by one-third, Western diplomats suggested setting the maximum

strength of the armies of the five Great Powers at 1 to 1.5 million for the USSR, USA and China, and at 700 to 800 thousand for Britain and France, but did not envisage an atomic weapons ban. This would have put the Soviet Union at a disadvantage, because at the time the United States was somewhat ahead in atomic weapons production. The Western powers declared then that they would be prepared to ban nuclear weapons, provided the Soviet Union agreed that the nuclear stockpiles would not be destroyed until after the armed forces and armaments were substantially reduced.

On May 10, 1955, the Soviet Union accepted both Western proposals. It appeared, after this important step was made, that the finalisation of the practical measures would not take long. But confusion reigned in Washington, London and Paris. It turned out that the Western governments had made their proposal on the assumption that the Soviet Union would reject it. Though greatly embarrassed, they broke off the disarmament negotiations.

Thus, the Western powers rejected their own proposals (for the *n*th time!). While talking disarmament, they continued the arms race.

Geneva Summit Conference (July 1955)

The Soviet Government took a series of other steps to relieve international tension and normalise inter-state relations. It was thanks to Soviet efforts and those of other socialist countries that the sanguinary war in Korea was brought to an end and an armistice was concluded in Indochina.¹ Soviet initiative in 1955 also furthered the solution of some other controversial issues, such as the conclusion of the State Treaty with Austria and the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and the FRG.

The climate was propitious in the summer of 1955 to convene in Geneva a conference of the Heads of Government of the USSR, USA, Britain and France, which had been contemplated and negotiated for some years.

The success of the Soviet initiatives was greatly facilitated by the support and joint action of the peace-loving

¹ See Chapter III.

countries and the far-flung popular struggle for peace. The World Peace Council appeal against atomic war preparations was signed by 660,000,000 people. Neither could the warmongers ignore the work of the World Peace Assembly in June 1955.

The Geneva Heads of Government Conference lasted from July 18 to 23. The agenda dealt with the German problem, disarmament, European security and the development of East-West contacts.

The Soviet Union suggested that the conference also discuss such vital issues as the situation in Asia and the Far East, termination of the cold war, and guarantees of security and territorial immunity for neutralist and non-aligned states. But the Western powers were unwilling to deal with these matters. The United States delegation demanded an examination of the so-called "problem of East European countries" and the "activities of world communism". The Soviet delegation, however, firmly rejected the attempt to use the conference for interference in the internal affairs of the East European states and demonstrated that the question of "activities of world communism" had no relation to the conference, convened to examine problems of inter-state relations and not the work of political parties.

The patently unacceptable topics were put forward by the US rulers, who had had to agree to the conference under public pressure, in order to obstruct its work. The same purpose was pursued by the provocative "atomic alarm" in the United States and the air manoeuvres held in Western Europe, which involved 3,000 planes imitating an atomic war. The US press made no secret of the fact that both were designed to exert psychological pressure on the Soviet Union.

The problem of European security was the most prominent item dealt with by the conference. The Soviet delegation took note of previous Western objections and supplemented its draft of the All-European Collective Security Treaty in order to bring the Soviet and Western positions closer. Most prominent was the proposal to implement the collective security plan in two stages. The Soviet Government consented to NATO and the Warsaw Treaty remaining operative in the first stage, with the members

of the two alignments promising to refrain from the use of armed force and to settle disputes by peaceful means.

In the second stage, they would undertake commitments concerning European collective security. The North Atlantic Pact, the Paris Agreements and the Warsaw Treaty would then become null and void, being replaced by an all-European system of collective security.

Another Soviet proposal was that the participants of the existing alignments should conclude a treaty rejecting the use of armed force against each other. This interim treaty, signed prior to a solution of the collective security problem, would have facilitated agreement on the collective security project.

The Soviet proposals were also designed to speed a settlement of the German problem.

However, the discussion of the collective security scheme yielded no tangible results. Since the members of the conference stated their wish to find an acceptable solution, they decided to submit all available proposals to the Foreign Ministers of the four powers.

The German problem, too, hung fire. The United States and its partners rejected the realistic and constructive Soviet proposals. What they wanted was for militarism and revanchism to revive in the Federal Republic.

The Geneva Conference also looked into the question of disarmament. The Soviet delegation suggested that the conference acknowledge the necessity of implementing some basic disarmament measures on which the views of the various powers either coincided or had come fairly close. To begin with, the Soviet spokesmen proposed that the numerical strength of the armed forces of the five Great Powers should be fixed by agreement, and that the procedure and time for the complete banning of nuclear weapons be formalised.

Since a convention on arms reduction and a banning of nuclear weapons was likely to take considerable time, the Soviet Government suggested that the countries concerned pledge not to use atomic and hydrogen weapons first.

The Western powers made counter-proposals designed to camouflage their rejection of their own previously-expressed position. President Eisenhower, for example, put

forward the "open skies" plan, whereby the Soviet Union and the United States would exchange military information and carry through aerial photography on each other's territory. In other words, control and spying were to precede disarmament. In effect, they were to replace disarmament. Britain, France and the other NATO partners of the United States backed Eisenhower's plan, extolling it as the most effective means of preventing war.

The Eisenhower Plan completely overlooked arms reduction and, consequently, envisaged a continued arms race. Besides, it put the Soviet Union at a disadvantage, since the "open skies" plan excluded the West European NATO countries, where numerous US war bases existed. In the circumstances, collection of information within Soviet frontiers would amount to outright and unilateral military intelligence. During the disarmament discussions, the British delegation suggested a zone of inspection on both sides of the line "now separating Eastern from Western Europe". This proposal, too, had the same pertinent defect as the American one. It relegated the main task of reducing armaments to the background.

Having reached no concrete decision, the Heads of Government decided to examine the disarmament problem at Foreign Ministers' level with consideration for the work done and the proposals made.

In conclusion, the Geneva Conference of Heads of Government discussed the question of contacts between East and West. The Soviet spokesmen advocated greater international economic and cultural relations and elimination of barriers. They urged an exchange of delegations, mutual visits of specialists in industry, agriculture, science and art, and of public leaders. The Western powers, for their part, said they were interested only in exchanging radio broadcasts and delegations of culture and art workers. They turned down practical measures to develop economic co-operation.

The discussion showed that contacts between East and West could be greatly expanded. Further study of the matter was also assigned to the Foreign Ministers.

The world public looked with hope to the Geneva Conference as a first step towards the final prevention of armed conflicts and the termination of the cold war.

Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers (1955)

The perceptible easing of international tension after the Summit Conference alarmed the monopolists who thrived on the arms race. Far from extending the co-operation contemplated in Geneva, the Western powers therefore launched a crusade against the very idea of such co-operation. President Eisenhower made a cold war statement, and a separate conference of the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Britain and France convened in New York in September 1955 to co-ordinate a negative attitude at the coming quadrilateral meet.

The Geneva Conference of the Soviet, US, British and French Foreign Ministers opened on October 27, 1955, and closed three weeks later.

Its agenda contained three items: European security and Germany; disarmament; and development of East-West contacts.

The Soviet Government submitted a new European collective security project. It suggested, for a start, to conclude a treaty involving the four Great Powers and all the other signatories of the Warsaw Treaty and the Western European Union, including the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany. No date was specified as to the termination of the North Atlantic Pact, the Western European Union and the Warsaw Treaty. It only proposed that this would be provided for after a European security treaty was concluded.

Bent on preventing positive decisions concerning European security and Germany, the West insisted on the so-called Eden Plan (named after Anthony Eden, then head of the British Government). This plan was designed to promote the absorption of the German Democratic Republic by West Germany, the militarisation of Germany, and its inclusion in NATO. The US, British and French delegations turned down the Soviet proposal that spokesmen of the GDR and FRG be invited to the conference. By so doing, they again plainly showed their reluctance to settle the German problem on a democratic and peaceful basis. This was corroborated by the NATO Council at its December 1955 session, which advocated nuclear weapons for NATO armies and the rapid rearmament of the FRG.

The Soviet delegation proposed that it be put down in the minutes that agreement had been reached on the strength of the armed forces and the procedure of implementing a nuclear arms ban, and considered it necessary to begin by examining the proposals made by the Heads of Government at the Geneva Conference.

The Soviet representatives also submitted a project for the development of East-West economic and cultural co-operation.

The Geneva Foreign Ministers' Conference made very slow progress. The Western spokesmen indulged in long and fruitless discussions of each little matter, thus reflecting the mood prevailing among the more reactionary quarters in Washington, London and Paris, who dreaded co-operation with the Soviet Union and refused to examine the items on the agenda on a basis of reciprocal consideration. In the long run, this made agreed decisions impossible.

Soviet Efforts to Improve Relations with the Great Powers

Despite the failure of the Geneva Foreign Ministers' Conference, the Soviet Government persisted in its efforts to improve the international climate. It devoted considerable attention to the matter of bettering relations with the Great Powers and, in particular, to mitigating relations between the USSR and the USA, the two biggest states in the world, which would have had a benign effect on the whole international situation.

The Soviet Union's bent for peace was proved by its record of nearly 50 years. The people of the Soviet Union nourish no ill-feelings towards the people of the United States. There have never been any territorial claims, and no other causes for armed conflict, between the two countries.

Eager to promote a rapid solution of key international problems and to reinforce world peace, the Soviet Government made a number of proposals in 1956 designed to normalise and improve Soviet-American relations. Among other things, it advocated mutually advantageous trade and cultural contacts, and put forward a number of other

suggestions consistent with the objective of an international détente. The Soviet initiatives, however, were rejected by the US Government.

The aggressive policies of the US ruling quarters impede better relations between the two countries. The US Government often says it intends to seek agreement with the Soviet Union in order to relieve international tension. Yet it continues to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign states, provokes armed conflicts and itself commits acts of aggression. The Soviet Union will never conclude agreements the imperialists could use against the liberation and revolutionary movements, to the detriment of Asian, African and Latin American countries and for exerting pressure on other socialist states.

The Soviet Government would also be happy to improve relations with Britain. Acting on the positive experience of Soviet-British co-operation during the Second World War, it suggested settling existing issues by the method of negotiation. In April 1956, a Soviet Government delegation visited London. The British public welcomed this friendly visit and called for greater contacts with the USSR. But vigorous pressure on the British Government was exerted by the opponents of a rapprochement with the Soviet Union. For one thing, the Soviet delegation was denied the opportunity to meet rank-and-file citizens, despite numerous invitations from municipal councils, business groups, public organisations and individuals.

The negotiations touched on numerous questions—the situation in the Middle East, disarmament, trade, cultural contacts, etc. The exchange of opinion showed that the main obstacle to greater Soviet-British contacts was presented by aggressive British aspirations in the Middle East and Britain's reluctance to abandon restrictions in its trade with the Soviet Union. The only concrete decision reached in the talks concerned cultural, scientific and technical relations.

For all this, the negotiations were marked by a spirit of frankness and realism. The joint communique pointed out that the two governments were convinced that "respect for national independence and sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in each other's internal

affairs constituted a basis for friendly co-operation and the peaceful coexistence of states”.

The Soviet Government attaches great importance to improving its relations and expanding co-operation with France. Geographically, regardless of the socio-economic regimes existing in the two countries, the Soviet Union and France are natural allies in combating the aggressive German imperialism. Past experience shows that such co-operation is vitally necessary, for in the two world wars the Soviet and French nations fought on the same side. In the Second World War, the people of France paid dearly for the refusal of their reactionary rulers to co-operate with the Soviet Union. The candidly revenge-seeking policy of the Bonn militarists showed, too, that it would be no less dangerous for France to forget past lessons in the post-war period.

Soon after the Soviet-British negotiations ended, a French Government delegation headed by Prime Minister Guy Mollet came to Moscow. The Guy Mollet government, which had come to power after an acute political crisis at the close of 1955, could not but reckon with the discontent running high among the French people over the “Atlantic” policy of France’s rulers. The government programme, therefore, included a statement of its intention to work for a relaxation of international strain and further the solution of the disarmament problem. Conscious of the popular support of the Soviet Union’s peace struggle, the Guy Mollet government pledged to negotiate better relations with the USSR.

But events showed that the cabinet of the Right Socialist leader did not mean to realise this programme. The demagogic statements had been made merely to pacify public opinion.

Guy Mollet’s dual policy affected the Soviet-French negotiations held in Moscow from May 16 to 19, 1956. Paris had decided beforehand to go no farther than Britain. This is why the French Government delegation, though it said it meant to follow the principle of peaceful coexistence, refused to support realistic Soviet proposals on key international issues. The only agreement reached in the talks concerned trade, cultural contacts and technical co-operation.

Although the negotiations yielded far lesser results than expected, the French visit had a definite political impact and exerted a positive influence on international affairs.

Soviet Proposals on Arms Reduction and Banning of Nuclear Weapons (1956-59)

The perceptible relaxation of international tension achieved through the efforts of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, went against the grain of the imperialists. For one thing, it had become more difficult for the US rulers to press on with the arms drive and keep the other capitalist countries, involved by US diplomacy in various aggressive blocs, toeing the line. In the autumn of 1956, international reaction touched off an Anglo-Franco-Israeli aggression against Egypt and a counter-revolutionary insurrection in Hungary.

These imperialist ventures, which drove the world to the brink of an armed disaster, showed once again that disarmament was still Problem No. 1 in international relations. On November 17, 1956, the Soviet Government submitted a plan for disarmament and international détente to the 9th UN General Assembly, which went far in meeting various Western wishes.

The Soviet proposals envisaged:

1) A reduction within two years of the armed forces of the Soviet Union, the United States and China to 1-1.5 million men, those of Britain and France to 650,000 men, and those of the other countries to 150-200 thousand men.

As a first step, the armed forces of the USSR, USA and China were to be reduced within a year to 2.5 million and those of Britain and France to 750 thousand men.

2) The banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons within two years, involving complete destruction of stockpiles and withdrawal from armouries.

As a first step, all tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons were to be discontinued forthwith.

3) The reduction by one-third in 1957 of the armed forces of the United States, Britain and France stationed in German territory.

A considerable reduction of the armed forces of the United States, Britain and France stationed in the NATO countries and of the armed forces of the Soviet Union stationed in the Warsaw Treaty countries.

The winding up within two years of foreign military bases in the territories of other states.

4) The reduction of military expenditures.

5) The establishment of strict and effective international control over disarmament. Siting of control posts to prevent sudden attack and authorisation of aerial photography in European areas where NATO and Warsaw Treaty armed forces are stationed (800 km east and west of the line of confrontation).

After considerable procrastination, the Western powers finally replied that a more limited programme of partial disarmament should be sought prior to searching for a basis for a broad agreement.

So on April 30, 1957, the Soviet Government tendered a proposal on partial disarmament. It covered:

1) The reduction by the five Great Powers of armaments and military budgets in two stages, at first by 15 per cent and then, additionally, in proportions to be later agreed.

2) The establishment of international control over the implementation of the above measures. Institution, for this purpose, of a control body within the framework of the UN Security Council and of control posts to prevent sudden attack.

3) A solemn undertaking to refrain from the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons of all kinds, and the undelayed solution of the nuclear test ban problem.

4) The reduction of the number of military bases in foreign territories.

5) Aerial inspections in an agreed zone of Europe and a broad zone in the Far East, including parts of the United States and the Soviet Union.¹

At the same time, the Soviet Government submitted the draft of a declaration on measures to strengthen world peace and the security of nations, envisaging an undertaking to refrain from the use of atomic and hydrogen

¹ See *Borba Sovetskogo Soyuzza za razoruzheniye, 1946-1960 gody*, Moscow, 1961, pp. 505-11.

weapons; to work for an agreement banning nuclear weapons; to condemn the propaganda of war and to base relations with other countries on the principle of peaceful coexistence.

The Soviet Union submitted its proposals on partial disarmament also to the 12th and, later, the 13th UN General Assemblies. The Soviet Government tried to meet halfway some of the Western objections. For example, it suggested that the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union should, as a preliminary measure, undertake to refrain from the use of nuclear weapons in a period of five years.

However, the United States and the other imperialist powers hindered the United Nations from adopting agreed positive disarmament solutions.

The many years of disarmament negotiation between the Soviet Union and the Western powers showed clearly that as soon as the Soviet Government expressed its readiness to meet Western wishes the latter instantly raised new objections and, in so doing, attempted to put the blame for the failure on the Soviet Union.

Unilateral Measures of the USSR and Other Socialist Countries in Reducing Their Armed Forces

Soviet efforts to settle the disarmament problem were backed up by measures of a unilateral nature. Soon after the war, the Soviet Government demobilised much of its armed forces. The Soviet Union did not wait for an international disarmament agreement to reduce its armies still more, hoping that the Western powers would follow suit. Four major reductions were made between 1955 and 1960:

by 640,000 in 1955;
by 1,200,000 in 1956-57;
by 300,000 in 1958, and
by 1,200,000 in 1960.

As a result, the numerical strength of the Soviet Armed Forces shrank to 2,423,000, that is, to less than the level suggested by the Western powers in 1956 for the USA and

the USSR (2,500,000 men), and to less than the strength of the US Armed Forces, although the area and the frontiers of the Soviet Union are considerably greater than those of the USA.

The Soviet Government also carried through other measures to relieve international tension. In 1955, it wound up its military bases in Porkalla Udd (Finland) and Port Arthur. In 1958, by agreement with the pertinent governments, part of the Soviet troops was withdrawn from the German Democratic Republic and Hungary. In the same year, Soviet troops in Rumania, stationed there under the Warsaw Treaty, were also completely withdrawn.

The other socialist countries, too, substantially reduced their armed forces:

the Polish People's Republic by 161,500 men,
the German Democratic Republic by 30,000,
the Rumanian People's Republic by 115,000,
the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic by 64,000,
the Hungarian People's Republic by 35,000, and
the People's Republic of Bulgaria by 41,000.

All in all, their armies were reduced by 446,500 men.

On March 31, 1958, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR adopted a decision to discontinue nuclear weapons tests in Soviet territory. The Soviet Government hoped that its action would usher in a world nuclear test ban.

If the Western powers had responded with concrete and practical measures reducing armaments, the steps taken by the Soviet and the other socialist governments would have given a start to general disarmament, and the solution of the disarmament problem would, in turn, have facilitated the adjustment of other crucial international matters.

It should be noted that the problem of control advanced by the West could not validly serve as an obstacle to the discontinuance of nuclear tests. This was noted, too, by the international conference of experts held in July-August 1958. This conference noted that no nuclear weapons tests could be concealed from the modern detection techniques.

Universal discontinuance of nuclear tests, therefore, did not jeopardise the security of any country, as contended by the United States and Britain. For all this, they again refused to accept the Soviet proposal. What is more, in

the course of several months (after the unilateral Soviet act) the United States made something like 50 tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons and effected dangerous and far-reaching war preparations.

In the circumstances, the Soviet Government was compelled in the interests of security to resume nuclear tests. It announced this on October 3, 1958, and again proposed on the following day at the 13th UN General Assembly that the United Nations should call on all states possessing atomic and hydrogen weapons to discontinue tests forthwith.

On October 31, the Soviet Government said in a statement that the Soviet Union would continue to work for an immediate and universal discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests.

Denuclearisation Proposals of the Socialist Countries

Denuclearisation of some regions of the globe would greatly reduce the threat of a nuclear war. The socialist states submitted concrete proposals to this effect on many occasions. The Polish Government, for example, put forward the idea of a nuclear-free zone in Central Europe. On October 2, 1957, Adam Rapacki, the Polish Foreign Minister, told the UN General Assembly that if the two German states banned the manufacture and use of atomic and nuclear weapons in their territories, Poland would be prepared to follow suit.

Czechoslovakia announced that it would gladly assume the same undertaking.

On October 5, 1957, the Government of the German Democratic Republic, which had earlier (July 1957) offered the FRG to conclude an agreement renouncing manufacture and dislocation of nuclear weapons in German territory, said in a telegram to the Chairman of the 12th UN General Assembly that it whole-heartedly backed the Polish initiative.

On February 14, 1958, the Polish Government followed up its earlier project with a proposal to the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain and France to consider the territories of the Polish People's Republic, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the German Democratic

Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany, with a total population of 113 million, as a zone excluded from the sphere of nuclear arming. This would have been an important contribution to the security of one of the most strained areas in Europe, where an unusually strong peacetime concentration of troops confronted each other. The danger that nuclear weapons would be used anywhere in the world would thus be greatly reduced.

The Polish proposal was supported by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. The Soviet Government announced on February 20, 1958, that it was ready to assume the appropriate undertakings if the United States, Britain and France acted accordingly.

World opinion, particularly the ruling circles in the Scandinavian countries, those of India and Canada, the press and some of the political leaders in Britain, France and West Germany, welcomed the proposal of an atom-free zone in Central Europe. But the United States rejected the idea out of hand. Its example was followed by the Federal Republic of Germany and its other partners of the aggressive imperialist blocs. They said that an atom-free zone in Central Europe would put them at a military disadvantage, because the Warsaw Treaty countries allegedly had greater conventional armed forces.

So the Polish Government came out with a fresh initiative. In November 1958, it announced that it was prepared, by agreement with its allied countries, to consider the establishment of the atom-free zone in two stages. In the first stage, it suggested the ban would affect manufacture of atomic weapons in the territories of Poland, Czechoslovakia, the GDR and the FRG, coupled with undertakings that armies stationed in the specified territory, and not possessing nuclear arms, should not receive them. In the second stage, all nuclear and rocket weapons would be completely withdrawn from the said zone, while conventional armed forces would simultaneously be reduced.

The Western powers did not accept this modified plan either, though it took account of their most essential objections. By doing so, they again showed their reluctance to improve the international climate.

The Soviet Government went farther than merely supporting the Polish plan. It suggested an atom- and

rocket-free zone in the Balkans and the Adriatic area. This idea was set out in a Soviet statement of June 25, 1959. The proposal said the Balkan countries (Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Yugoslavia and Greece), and Italy too, should undertake to refrain from allowing atomic and rocket bases in their territory.

The opponents of peace in the Balkans alleged, however, that the security of some of the above countries would not then be sufficiently guaranteed. The Soviet Government suggested in its reply that the United States, Britain, France and the USSR should formally guarantee the security and independence of the countries of the said zone.

The Soviet proposal was made doubly important by the fact that the governments of Turkey, Italy and Greece had at the time agreed under US pressure to allow American atomic and rocket bases in their countries. The Soviet idea won extensive support in the Balkans. The Rumanian People's Republic welcomed it and took the initiative by inviting Balkan Heads of Government to a conference to discuss all urgent problems, including the atom-free zone project. The Bulgarian Government, too, declared itself willing to consider its territory as part of the zone.

The Soviet Union, Poland and the German Democratic Republic suggested to proclaim the Baltic Sea area a zone of peace. This would have greatly improved the political climate in Northern Europe. In 1958, the USSR also recommended to turn the Middle East into a zone of peace.

In January 1959, the Soviet Government came out with a proposal to create a zone of peace, particularly an atom-free zone, in the Far East and the basin of the Pacific Ocean.

An atom-free zone covering North, Central and South Europe would have created a broad denuclearised strip, from the Arctic Ocean to the Mediterranean, where NATO and Warsaw Treaty armies confront each other. This would mean that neither a small conflict, nor lack of caution by military personnel, nor any other accident, could cause a nuclear war.

The denuclearisation proposals won the support of world opinion, which sized them up rightly as an effective means of consolidating peace. Only the Western rulers opposed the idea on various pretexts.

**SOVIET UNION, GDR
AND OTHER SOCIALIST STATES OPPOSE
REVIVAL OF GERMAN MILITARISM,
WORK FOR A PEACE SETTLEMENT WITH GERMANY
AND FOR A NORMALISATION OF THE SITUATION
IN WEST BERLIN**

The Soviet Union and the German Question

One of the most complicated and important post-war problems is that of Germany.

The substance of the problem is that militarism and revanchism have got to be extirpated and conditions have to be created for Germany's peaceful and democratic development.

This would effectively prevent Germany from becoming the seat of a new world war, of fresh aggressions, and would consolidate European security and world peace.

During the Second World War, the powers of the anti-Hitler coalition—the USSR, USA and Britain—adopted programmatic decisions about Germany's post-war development. These were most fully set out in the documents of the 1945 Potsdam Conference. "German militarism and nazism will be extirpated," they said, "and the Allies will take in agreement together, now and in the future, the other measures necessary to assure that Germany never again will threaten her neighbours or the peace of the world." The Potsdam decisions visualised post-war Germany as a peaceful, democratic state.

In a nutshell, demilitarisation and democratisation were defined as the main principles which the allies of the anti-Hitler coalition were to follow in their post-war relations with Germany. Strict and consistent implementation of these principles, and a peace treaty in which these would be fully stipulated, was the only democratic way of solving the German problem. Acting strictly on the decisions reached by the four powers at Potsdam and leaning on the democratic forces of the German people, the Soviet Union put into effect all necessary measures in East Germany to wipe out militarism and nazism and carry through important democratic reforms. If the other members of the Potsdam Conference had done the same a peace treaty would

long since have been signed and the German problem would no longer have plagued Europe. It would no longer have served as the main source of European tension.

But the imperialist powers violated the Potsdam decisions, partitioned Germany by forming Bizonia and Trizonia and, finally, in 1949, a Bonn state based on reactionary monopoly and clerical support.

Militarism and revanchism are reviving rapidly in West Germany which is occupied by the United States, Britain and France. Step by step, the Western powers are turning the Federal Republic of Germany into the chief staging area for aggression against the USSR and the other socialist countries. They are encouraging neo-nazi and revanchist organisations, and are continuously rejecting Soviet proposals of a German peace treaty, which would put an end to the course of events that jeopardises peace and imperils the very future of the people of Germany. This is why the German peace and normalisation of the West Berlin situation lined up with the problem of general and complete disarmament, the abolition of the remnants of colonialism and other vital problems is one of the most urgent and basic issues of contemporary international relations.

The importance of a peaceful adjustment of the German problem was referred to at the 20th, 21st and 22nd congresses of the CPSU, at sessions of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and in the speeches of top leaders of the CPSU and the Soviet state. This spoke of the close attention the Party and Government of the Soviet Union devoted to the German problem. Germany was discussed repeatedly at international conferences and bilateral negotiations on the initiative of the USSR.

The realistic attitude and the constructive proposals of the Soviet Union are backed by all peace-loving forces, those of the German nation included.

The CPSU and the Soviet Government are doing their utmost to strengthen the fraternal friendship with the German Democratic Republic and to normalise relations with the FRG, the other German state. After all, the future of Europe depends to a very great extent on how these relations develop. It will not be too much to say that peace and friendship between the Soviet and German peoples is one of the cornerstones of enduring peace.

While friendship and co-operation between the USSR and the GDR are going from strength to strength, as evidenced by the Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Aid and Co-operation concluded on June 12, 1964, Soviet relations with West Germany still leave much to be desired. The Bonn rulers, who are nursing plans of revenge and aggression, wish no such improvement and this has a negative effect on the international situation in Europe.

Soviet Efforts to Conclude a Peace Treaty with Germany

Ever since the Second World War, the Soviet Union has been advocating a German solution on a peaceful and democratic basis. Soviet diplomats worked for this end at sessions of the Council of Foreign Ministers of the USSR, USA, Britain and France, at the Allied Control Council for Germany, at international conferences and at bilateral talks, etc. At the London session of the Council of Foreign Ministers (November-December 1947), the Soviet delegation said that "the basic question for Germany is the question of a peace treaty".¹ At the same time, the Soviet Union submitted concrete proposals designed to solve this question.

In March 1952, the Soviet Government published the draft of the Basic Provisions of a Peace Treaty with Germany. The draft envisaged Germany's reunification; withdrawal of occupation troops and winding up of military bases not later than a year after conclusion of the treaty; provision of democratic rights to the people of Germany; free existence of progressive parties and organisations in Germany; the banning of organisations inimical to democracy and peace, etc. Germany was to undertake to stay out of coalitions and military alliances aimed against any of the states that participated in the anti-Nazi war. German territory was defined within the frontiers established at the Potsdam Conference. No restrictions were set on the development of Germany's peaceful economy, commerce and shipping, and on her access to world markets. She

¹ *Vneshnyaya politika Sovetskogo Soyuza, 1947 god*, Part II, Gospolitizdat, 1952, p. 246.

could also have national armed forces necessary for her defence. The draft also envisaged that its signatories would support Germany's admission to the United Nations.

The Soviet project provided an excellent starting point for a German settlement. But this was just the thing the Western powers did not want. They adopted dilatory tactics and put off the discussion of the Soviet proposals. It was their old line of blocking the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany.

In August 1953, the Soviet Union suggested to the United States, Britain and France that a conference be convened within six months to examine the question of the German peace treaty. The Soviet Government intimated that a rapid solution of this vital matter would be facilitated by the establishment of a provisional all-German government, formed through the collaboration of the parliaments of the GDR and the FRG. The provisional government would prepare and hold free elections, in which the German people would state their opinion as to the social and political system in the future democratic Germany.

Furthermore, the Soviet Government called on the Western powers to reduce Germany's financial and economic burdens related to the consequences of the war. The above-mentioned draft of the Basic Provisions of a Peace Treaty with Germany was attached to the pertinent Soviet note.

The Western powers declined to consider the Soviet proposals. All they consented to was a four-power Foreign Ministers' conference, which took place in Berlin in January-February 1954. At the suggestion of the Soviet delegation, the Berlin Foreign Ministers' conference examined the German problem and the ways and means of consolidating European security, the question of the Austrian State Treaty, etc.

The Soviet Union set out a constructive programme for the adjustment of the German problem, which it described as the principal unresolved problem of the post-war period. The accent in the programme was laid on preparing and concluding a peace treaty. The draft of the Basic Provisions of a Peace Treaty, reinforced by new articles reflecting current changes, and proposals concerning the procedure of preparing the peace treaty and convening a peace conference were put on the agenda. The draft provided

that no political or military commitments following from treaties and agreements signed by the GDR and FRG prior to the conclusion of the peace treaty and to their reunification, would be imposed on the reunified Germany. The USSR suggested that Deputies of the Foreign Ministers should within three months prepare the draft of the peace treaty and convene a peace conference to examine it not later than October 1954. The Soviet proposals envisaged the forming of a provisional all-German government, free all-German elections, and withdrawal of occupation troops (before the elections). The Soviet Government also recommended that the country be relieved of its post-war debts to the four powers, that its financial and economic burdens consequent on the war be eased, etc.

The Soviet delegation suggested that the people of Germany take direct part in preparing the peace treaty. It urged a referendum, in which the Germans could say what they wanted—militarisation or a peace treaty. The Soviet proposals also envisaged broad co-operation between the GDR and FRG in promoting a rapprochement and the recreation of a united Germany.

The Soviet delegation also pointed out that economic and cultural co-operation between the USSR and FRG was both possible and desirable.

The Soviet collective security proposals put forward at the conference could have gone a long way in facilitating a German solution if they had been accepted by the West.

However, the United States, Britain and France reacted negatively to the Soviet proposals. Also, they refused to invite GDR and FRG spokesmen to the conference. They revived the imperialist Eden Plan. This time they laid the accent on "free" elections based on an election law worked out by the four powers and held under their control in the presence of their troops. Conclusion of a peace treaty was provided for at a remoter stage. The future of the reunified land, the Western powers maintained, would be tied up with the commitments previously assumed by the FRG. In other words, the Eden Plan would direct the development of the reunified Germany along a reactionary and militarist track.

The Eden Plan could not resolve the German problem. It went against the decisions of the Potsdam Conference,

the interests of European security and the national interests of the German people.

Due to Western resistance, the discussion of the German problem at the Berlin Conference yielded no tangible results.

In January 1955, the Soviet Government came out with a new initiative designed to speed a German settlement. It suggested general elections before the end of the year in which the people of Germany could express their will regarding the country's unification and future order. To facilitate agreement, the Soviet Government agreed to appropriate international supervision over the elections, provided the governments of the GDR and FRG did not object to it. This modification of the Soviet proposal went a long way in meeting Western wishes and was prompted by the Soviet desire to work out mutually acceptable decisions as quickly as possible. Implementation of the Soviet proposals would have helped Germany's reunification and the subsequent conclusion of a peace treaty, formalising the country's independence and sovereignty, and the results of the Second World War, bridling the forces of revenge and militarism, and offering the German people an opportunity for peaceful and democratic development.

The Western powers, who had long capitalised on the question of free all-German elections and played on the national sentiments of the German people, opposed the Soviet proposal out of hand. Their policy consisted in preventing Germany's unification at all costs. They feared that a reunified Germany would in time become a redoubtable commercial rival. The reunification of Germany, in any shape or form, the *New York Times* said in November 1955, is not to the taste of either the French, who dread the emergence of a strong Germany, or the British, who are already beginning to feel German competition. They fear that the effects of this competition will become stronger still if Germany is unified.

In effect, this was the wartime position reflected in the Anglo-American Morgenthau Plan, which envisaged Germany's partitioning and conversion "into a country primarily agricultural and pastoral in its character".

Bonn's attitude towards Germany's reunification was just as negative. Konrad Adenauer said in the summer of

1954 that he was the first German Chancellor to prefer European unity to the unity of his own country. It will be recalled that in the 1920s, when Adenauer was oberbürgermeister of Cologne, he was known as a zealous separatist, a man who advocated the separation from Germany of part of her territory. Speaking of European "unity", he implied the integration of reactionary imperialist forces against the USSR and the other socialist states, and against the revolutionary and liberation movements.

Termination of the State of War with Germany (1955)

While the United States, Britain and France were sabotaging a solution of the German problem, the Soviet Union was eager to develop friendly relations with the German people.

In 1953, the Soviet Government decided to waive reparations from the GDR as of January 1, 1954; to transfer the property of Soviet enterprises in GDR territory to the GDR without compensation; to reduce GDR expenditures for the maintenance of Soviet troops stationed in that country to five per cent of the GDR budget; to relieve the GDR from paying debts incurred from external occupation expenditures since 1945, and from repaying post-war Soviet loans. The agreement reached between the governments of the USSR and GDR was formalised in the protocol of talks held in Moscow in August 1953. An understanding was also reached about additional shipments of food and raw materials to the GDR, and on further Soviet credits. The diplomatic missions in Moscow and Berlin were converted into embassies.

The statement "On Relations Between the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic" (1954) was a fresh token of the friendship developing between the Soviet and German peoples. The statement said that the Soviet Government had decided to establish with the GDR the same relations that it had with other sovereign states. The German Democratic Republic was given the opportunity to handle independently her domestic and foreign affairs, including questions of relations with the FRG. The Soviet Government terminated the supervision of GDR bodies

of state by the High Commissioner of the USSR. It took note of the GDR Government's pledge to observe the commitments implicit in the Potsdam Agreements. The GDR statement to this effect pointed to the incompatibility with democratic principles and the national rights of the German people of the "occupation status" instituted by the United States, Britain and France for the FRG, which impeded the rapprochement and reunification of the two German states.

The working people of the GDR and progressives in West Germany and the rest of the world hailed the new Soviet measure. *Die Zeit*, a Berlin newspaper, said it was highly instructive to compare developments in the East and West of Germany. "Here a sovereign government, which can freely, without interference, conduct its internal and external affairs, as well as negotiations with West Germany, and there a regime hemmed in by the occupation status and the General Treaty giving the occupation powers the right to interfere in the domestic life of West Germany, particularly if it concerns an all-German rapprochement."

Western determination to obstruct a German peace settlement created a seat of tension in the heart of Europe. Besides, the Western attitude was likely to affect adversely the relations of the Soviet and German peoples if the legal state of war between the USSR and Germany continued indefinitely. This is why, on January 25, 1955, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR issued a decree on the termination of the state of war between the Soviet Union and Germany.

Ten years after hostilities had ended, the decree said, "Germany is still split and lacking a peace treaty, and the German people continue to be in an unequal position in relation to other peoples". The policy of the United States, Britain and France, bent on remilitarising West Germany and involving her in aggressive alliances, obstructed the conclusion of a German peace treaty. Prompted by the desire to strengthen friendly relations with the German Democratic Republic and cognisant of the interests of the population of the two German states, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR announced the termination of the state of war and the re-establishment of peaceful relations between the USSR and Germany. The legal

restrictions regarding German citizens, springing from the state of war, were thus waived.

In the meantime, the Western powers persisted in their anti-Potsdam policy. This was betokened by the Paris Agreements of 1954.

Paris Agreements of 1954 and the Stepped-Up Militarisation of the FRG

In the mid-fifties the Western powers stepped up their efforts to rebuild the war-industrial potential of the FRG with the object of rearming the country and admitting it to NATO and other restricted Western politico-military and economic groupings.

This purpose was served by the so-called Bonn agreements, concluded by the United States, Britain, France, and the FRG in May 1952 and the Paris Agreements, signed in October 1954 by the above-mentioned countries and their allies.

The Paris Agreements were designed to lift restrictions on the build-up of the war-industrial power of big West German capital, which had twice touched off world wars. The Agreements provided for the establishment of FRG armed forces consisting of 12 infantry divisions, an air force and a navy. To mislead public opinion, Bonn was prohibited in deliberately vague terms to produce atomic, chemical, bacteriological and other weapons of mass annihilation. However, the Agreements evaded the question of West Germany's possible acquisition of nuclear weapons. The facts showed, too, that the Western powers were not really determined to enforce these purely formal restrictions in earnest.

The Paris Agreements set the stage for Bonn's admission to NATO and the Western European Union. The FRG Government pledged demagogically "never to resort to force in achieving the unification of Germany or altering the present frontiers" and "to settle all disputes with other countries by peaceful means".

But this specious pledge could not conceal the fact that the FRG had entered the arms race and become a most important link in the aggressive Western blocs.

The Paris Agreements set out the intention of the United States, Britain and France to frustrate a peace settlement with Germany and deepen its split. They said, for example, that the international situation prevents the "reunification of Germany and the conclusion of a peace settlement", and alleged that her post-war frontiers were not final. Totally ignoring the existence of the German Democratic Republic, a sovereign state, the Western powers proclaimed the FRG Government as the sole "representative of the German people in international affairs".¹ The future united Germany, the Agreements said, "will be integrated within the European Community". Furthermore, the United States, Britain and France reasserted their "rights" to maintain armed forces in West Berlin. Thus, the Paris Agreements reflected the candidly anti-Potsdam policy of the Western powers. They led up to the nullification of the Potsdam decisions and to a still more intensive cold war against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

The Soviet Union and progressives all over the world exposed the aggressive substance of the Paris Agreements. It became still more important to rally the peoples to the fight against the revival of German militarism and the preparation of a new world war. Implementation of the Paris Agreements, said a Soviet note to the governments of the West European countries and the United States in November 1954, "would mean that Germany's unification

¹ This unrealistic conception is now known as the Hallstein Doctrine. It appeared soon after the establishment of the separate Bonn state and was officially formulated at a conference of West German ambassadors in Bonn in December 1955, getting its name from the then State Secretary of the FRG Foreign Ministry, Hallstein, who is now one of the top administrators of the European Economic Community.

The Hallstein Doctrine ignored the existence of two German states and proclaimed the Federal Republic of Germany the sole "lawful" representative of the German people in the international arena. Aimed primarily against the German Democratic Republic, it envisaged that the Federal Republic of Germany would refuse to establish or maintain diplomatic relations with countries who recognised the German Democratic Republic. This expansionist position was epitomised by West Germany's rupturing diplomatic relations with Yugoslavia in 1957 and Cuba in 1963. It was also highlighted by the ceaseless and crude blackmail of sovereign states in Asia and Africa who wished to cooperate with the German Democratic Republic.

by free all-German elections will be sacrificed to the present plans of restoring German militarism, this deadly foe of the peoples of Europe, including the German people themselves”.

The working people of the Federal Republic of Germany stepped up their struggle against remilitarisation. In January 1955, they held the biggest of all post-war strikes. The executive of the *Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund* decided to launch a popular movement against the ratification of the Paris Agreements. Signatures were collected under the demand of a referendum in which the population could state its opinion concerning the country's rearmament. A day of struggle against the Paris Agreements was held in the FRG in March 1955. Conscious of the people's sentiments, the leadership of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany publicly condemned the ratification of the Paris Agreements.

All this affected the debate in the Bundestag, which was postponed twice. In the long run, however, the Bundestag endorsed the Paris Agreements, although 157 deputies voted against it.

The situation in Europe changed radically when the Paris Agreements entered into force in May 1955. The scene was set for German militarism to build up its military power. The FRG became a member of the aggressive North Atlantic bloc. The Paris Agreements erected new, very substantial obstacles to the solution of the German problem on a democratic and peaceful basis.

The governing groups in Bonn set to realising the Paris Agreements with feverish haste. In the mid-fifties, the FRG bought big consignments of arms abroad. By the end of 1958, it had acquired rocket missiles, tanks, jet planes, warships, ammunition and other war materiel to the tune of nearly \$1,500 million on the strength of an agreement with the United States (December 1955). Its military purchases in Britain, France, Canada and other NATO countries added up to hundreds of millions of marks.

While speaking their wish to see “the nation reunited”, the rulers in Bonn did their utmost to obstruct reunification. Their measures of militarising the country created additional barriers. “In the interests of reunification”, said the bulletin of the Bonn Press and Information Department

in July 1956, “it is essential that we make the utmost haste”.

A society for nuclear research was founded in the Federal Republic of Germany in 1954. Scientists were put to work to develop rockets and guided missiles. In 1956, the Defence Ministry of the FRG was already able to place military orders with West German firms. Many of the factories in West Germany had begun producing arms and military equipment.

At the same time, Bonn was busy activating the *Bundeswehr*. Top posts in the *Bundeswehr* were distributed to former Nazi generals and officers. A spirit of revenge and aggression was cultivated in the army. Numerous militarist societies and revanchist organisations came to life. They called candidly for a revision of the frontiers, for the “absorption” of the GDR and for war against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

In March 1956, Chancellor Adenauer's government succeeded in changing the Constitution of the FRG and was allowed to rush military orders through the Bundestag unimpeded. The West German *Neue Rhein-Zeitung* said that after the Constitution was changed “the preparatory period of arming ended”. A universal conscription law was passed in June 1956, and in December the NATO Council passed a decision to accelerate the rearmament of the FRG and to equip NATO armed forces with nuclear weapons.

A campaign against progressives began in the FRG under the anti-communist banner. An anti-democratic election law was passed in March 1956. In August, the authorities outlawed the Communist Party. The CC CPSU statement on this gross violation of democracy and of the agreed Allied decisions on the German question said that the banning of the German Communist Party was a link “in the general chain of measures designed to convert West Germany into a militarist state, a dangerous seat of a new war and reaction in Europe”.

Thus, step by step, the rulers of the Federal Republic of Germany acted on the will of domestic and international reaction to militarise the country. The public utterances of the Bonn revenge-seekers became more and more outspoken. In October 1956, Adenauer declared: “We shall speak

with the Soviet Union, but not until we are armed to the teeth."

A dangerous seat of war thus matured in the heart of Europe.

20th Congress of the CPSU on the German Problem

Fresh efforts were called for in the circumstances on the part of the peace-loving peoples. As we have seen, the Soviet Union carried through a series of important measures in a short space of time to consolidate peace and security in Europe and to settle the German problem.

As a result, the international prestige of the Soviet Union and the GDR grew considerably. The architects of war, who were reviving German militarism in high gear, were unmasked. New strength was infused into the peace movement.

The 20th Congress of the CPSU summed up the results of the strenuous efforts made by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, together with the peace-loving forces of the world, against the emergence of a seat of aggression in the heart of Europe.

The Report of the CC CPSU to the 20th Congress pointed out:

"A collective security system in Europe, renunciation of the Paris Agreements, rapprochement and co-operation between the two German states—this is the right way to settle the German question."¹

Realistic opportunities existed in the post-war world for solving the German problem in the interests of the peace and security of the peoples, including the people of Germany. To begin with, the might of the peace-loving Soviet Union had grown to unprecedented proportions. Together with the Soviet Union, the countries of Southeast Europe formed a dependable barrier to any possible aggression of the German revenge-seekers. Austria, once Hitler's reserve, proclaimed her neutrality. All over Europe, the peace-loving forces were fighting the battle for peace. The situation and balance of strength within Germany itself was quite different to what it once was. The German Demo-

¹ Report of the 20th Party Congress, Moscow, 1956, p. 33.

cratic Republic had become so solid that any solution of the German problem was unthinkable without her. In the Federal Republic of Germany, too, patriotic forces opposed their country's conversion into a seat of war.

Backed by the decisions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, Soviet diplomacy mounted a battle for peace with redoubled energy. Greater fraternal friendship and co-operation with the GDR was of the utmost importance. Bilateral negotiations in July 1956 and in January and August 1957 went a long way in consolidating Soviet-GDR relations. As of January 1, 1957, the Soviet Government reduced by half the money allocated by the GDR for the maintenance of Soviet troops temporarily stationed in her territory. Some other political and economic questions were also settled to the satisfaction of both sides.

The negotiations stressed that the reunification of the German state was the affair of the German people itself. Reunification could be achieved only by agreement between the governments of the GDR and FRG. The conferees warned aggressive Western circles that all forcible methods on their part in solving the German problem, and likewise all hostile acts against the people's democratic system in the GDR, would be repulsed.

Conclusion of the State Treaty with Austria

Solution of the Austrian question, that of the State Treaty with Austria, was highly important for European security. It will be recalled that Hitler Germany annexed Austria in 1938. Consistently, the Soviet Union favoured the restoration of an independent Austrian state. In December 1941, during the visit to Moscow of Anthony Eden, then Britain's Foreign Minister, the Soviet Government suggested "restoring Austria as an independent state". In the autumn of 1943, the Moscow Conference of the Foreign Ministers of the USSR, USA and Britain, adopted a declaration on Austria, proclaiming the Anschluss invalid and stating the wish of the three Great Powers "to see a free and independent Austria".

After the Second World War ended, the independence of Austria was indeed restored. But this was not formalised

by treaty for many years. The Western powers made no secret of their intention to turn the country into an "alpine NATO fortress". The revenge-seekers in Bonn dreamt of a new Anschluss. The seizure of Austria was defined as one of the goals of the Bonn programme, which became doubly perilous after the Paris Agreements had come into force. This is why conclusion of a State Treaty with Austria was highly important. It would deliver a death blow to the Western policy of militarising and nazifying Austria, and would also squash the revenge-seeking plans of the FRG monopolists.

The decisive part in settling the matter was played by the Soviet Union. In February 1955, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR noted that further procrastination over the State Treaty with Austria was totally unjustified and that it was necessary to withdraw occupation troops from Austria prior to the conclusion of the German peace treaty.

Soviet-Austrian negotiations, which created a basis for a swift settlement of the Austrian question, were held in Moscow on the initiative of the Soviet Government in April 1955. Chancellor Julius Raab said at the time: "We could scarcely believe that everything we barely dared to hope has become reality." The *Wiener Zeitung*, the Austrian government paper, said "Moscow has ushered in a new era for Austria".

The noble efforts of the Soviet Union went against the grain of some Western politicians, for they contradicted the imperialist plans in regard to Austria. The United States was put out of countenance, wrote the *New York Herald Tribune*, that the Russians had removed the remaining obstacles to the conclusion of a treaty with Austria.

On May 15, 1955, the Foreign Ministers of the USSR, USA, Britain, France and Austria gathered in Vienna and signed the State Treaty, which restored an independent and democratic Austria. The Treaty went into force in July 1955, and in October the Austrian Parliament passed a constitutional law on permanent neutrality. Austria pledged to stay out of military alliances and to let no other country maintain military bases in her territory. In December 1955, the four Great Powers (USSR, USA, Britain and France) recognised Austria's permanent neutrality.

The State Treaty restored the sovereignty of Austria and terminated the occupation regime. It guaranteed the country's security and ruled out an economic or political Anschluss by Germany. The articles which preclude the transfer of former German assets into the possession of FRG monopolists are of great importance. The Austrian Government has undertaken to outlaw organisations which advocate Anschluss or carry on pan-Germanic propaganda.

The conclusion of the State Treaty and the proclamation of Austria's neutrality have contributed greatly to European security and eased international tension.

A joint Soviet-Austrian communique issued in the summer of 1960 said:

"Both sides believe that Austria's permanent neutrality is a positive contribution to the efforts of relaxing international tension and consolidating peace."

The Soviet Union shows every respect for Austria's neutrality and independence. However, note should be taken of the fact that the imperialists, especially those of the FRG, have been conspiring assiduously against Austria's neutral policies in the last few years.

Establishment of Diplomatic Relations Between the USSR and FRG (1955)

The Soviet Union bases its relations with the two German states on respect for the sovereign rights of the German people. As we have seen, the Soviet Government continuously stresses the need to let Germans settle their own future. It is the Western powers who spurn the sovereign rights of the German nation, and who object to representatives of the German people participating in the discussion of the German problem. It is they, too, who refuse to recognise the German Democratic Republic.

In June 1955, the Soviet Government expressed its willingness to normalise relations with West Germany, hoping that this may facilitate the solution of the German problem. A Government delegation of the FRG headed by Chancellor Adenauer came to Moscow on its invitation in September 1955.

An agreement was reached on the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two states and on the institution of embassies in Moscow and Bonn. The two countries agreed on initiating trade negotiations.

Most sections of the West German population received the results of the Moscow talks with satisfaction.

The Moscow negotiations revealed the weakness of Bonn's foreign policy, which is unrealistic in relation to the contemporary situation and the new balance of world strength. It marked the collapse of West Germany's attempt to speak with the Soviet Union "from positions of strength".

Treaty on Relations Between the USSR and GDR (September 20, 1955)

Persevering in its efforts to extend its friendly relations with the German people, the Soviet Union concluded a treaty on relations between the USSR and GDR on September 20, 1955.

"The signatories," says its Article 1, "solemnly declare that relations between them are based on total equality, mutual respect of sovereignty and non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

"Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic is free to deal with all questions concerning her internal and external policy, including her relations with the Federal Republic of Germany and her relations with other states."

It is the main purpose of the signatories, the Treaty said, "to achieve a peace settlement for all Germany by means of appropriate negotiations". The Treaty envisaged joint efforts by the Soviet Union and the GDR to consolidate peace and security in Europe and provided for all-round mutual co-operation.

The temporary stationing of Soviet troops in GDR territory was also discussed. A special agreement on this score was concluded by the two fraternal countries in March 1957.

The Treaty on Relations Between the USSR and the GDR conformed with the national interests of the German people. The late Otto Grotewohl, then Prime Minister of the GDR, said: "The Treaty and the negotiations in Moscow

give us confidence that the gains of the German Democratic Republic and the foundations of socialism in our state have been made secure for all time and will never be left in the lurch."

War Danger in Europe Mounts as Militarism Revives in the FRG

A few years after the Paris Agreements went into force, West German militarism, actively supported by the USA, Britain and France, became a dangerous adversary to peace in Europe.

West Germany's military credits mounted steeply in 1955-58. By mid-1959, as much as 60 per cent of the armaments for the Bundeswehr were already being produced within the FRG. More than 200,000 people were drafted into the Bundeswehr. In March 1958, the Bundestag passed a resolution empowering the government to equip the Bundeswehr with atomic weapons and rocket missiles. "The arming of the Bundeswehr and its equipment with all available types of atomic weapons," the then Defence Minister of the FRG, Franz Josef Strauss, said, "will proceed in all haste." The Bundeswehr began to claim a leading part in NATO.

Only naturally, the Soviet Union could not look on indifferently. In a communication to the FRG Bundestag, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR pointed out in March 1958 that "the implementation of the decision to equip the FRG army with atomic weapons and rocket missiles, like the projected consent to the stationing of foreign atomic and missile bases in West Germany, is leading to a situation in Europe that greatly resembles the situation in which Hitler Germany set out to prepare the Second World War".

The Supreme Soviet warned in all earnest that in our time all FRG attempts to launch military ventures would be tantamount to national suicide.¹

¹ See *Sbornik osnovnykh aktov i dokumentov Verkhovnogo Sovieta SSSR po venednepoliticheskim voprosam, 1956-1962*. Moscow, 1962, p. 62.

The Soviet Union denounced Bonn's admission to the European Economic Community¹ and the European Atomic Energy Community,² inasmuch as this deepened the split in Europe. In March 1957, the Soviet Foreign Minister pointed out in a statement that Euratom and the Common Market entailed dangerous consequences. He said that they would "erect new serious obstacles to the restoration of the national unity of the German people, because West Germany would be still deeper involved in the system of restricted Western military groupings opposed to other European states".

The revenge-seekers in the FRG no longer needed to camouflage their aggressive goals. Chancellor Adenauer told the Bundestag in so many words (March 1958) that "the Soviet Union, the Eastern bloc, is the potential adversary of NATO".

West Berlin, turned into a centre of subversion, espionage, sabotage and hostile propaganda against the socialist countries, was assigned a prominent role in the imperialists' aggressive plans. The bourgeois press described it as a "centre of penetration into the East" and a "front-line city".

As West German militarism regained strength, West Berlin's role became more and more obvious. Small wonder that the more bellicose of the Western politicians said: "Berlin (West) is worth a war."

In the late 1950s, the position of West German imperialism among the leading capitalist countries grew considerably stronger. It gained prominence within the NATO system. Bonn's revenge-seeking policies as regards Eastern and Western Europe became much more incisive. What was particularly dangerous was that the Bundeswehr

¹ A state-monopoly association of six countries—Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, Luxembourg, France and the FRG. The Treaty governing its establishment entered into force in January 1958. The EEC, in which the FRG monopolies play a top role, is subordinated to NATO goals and aimed at splitting Europe, creating restricted economic and politico-military blocs of imperialist states.

² A restricted state-monopoly association consisting of the same countries as the EEC. The Treaty governing its establishment entered into force in January 1958. The purpose of Euratom is to give economic sinew to the NATO Council's decision to equip NATO troops with nuclear weapons and speed the development of nuclear weapons.

began receiving the latest weapons. The FRG was quickly turning into the principal seat of the war danger in Europe.

This is why the German problem, whose proper solution is of immense importance to peace and security, was listed first among all the vital international problems at the extraordinary 21st Congress of the CPSU.

Soviet Draft of a Peace Treaty, January 10, 1959

Considerable changes occurred since the publication of the Soviet draft of the Basic Provisions of a Peace Treaty with Germany in 1952 both in the international situation and in Germany itself. To begin with, there could no longer be any question of a peace treaty with a united Germany. The Paris Agreements had deepened the rift between the two German states. The GDR and FRG developed in diametrically opposite directions. The only way to overcome the split was by a gradual rapprochement. In these circumstances, the Soviet Union proposed that a peace treaty be signed with both the GDR and the FRG, or their confederation if such were established.

In view of the increasingly dangerous role played by West Berlin in the imperialists' cold war against the socialist community, the Soviet Government provided in its proposals that the city be turned into an independent political unit.

Compared with the Basic Provisions of a Peace Treaty with Germany, the new Soviet draft submitted on January 10, 1959, was an exhaustive document centred on eliminating the survivals of the Second World War in Europe.

The draft was forwarded to the governments of the United States, Britain, France, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany and to countries which had participated in the anti-nazi war.¹ It consisted of a preamble (demonstrating the necessity of a peace treaty and its purposes) and six sections totalling 48 articles. Section I consisted of political and territorial

¹ Albania, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Hungary, India, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, the People's Republic of China, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia and the South African Union.

provisions, Section II of provisions concerning the reunification of Germany, Section III and IV contained the military and economic articles, Section V—articles concerning reparations and restitutions,¹ and Section VI—the concluding provisions.

The commitments which Germany, represented by the GDR and FRG, was to undertake envisaged her development as a peace-loving and democratic state. Article 4 provided that Germany should pledge to settle her international disputes by peaceful means only and not jeopardise international peace and security, and should not enter into any military alliances against any power party to the peace treaty (Article 5). Articles 8-12 formalised the existing German frontiers as defined by the Potsdam Conference, and Article 13 ruled out a new Anschluss of Austria by Germany.

Articles 14-18 dealt with the democratisation of public life and ensured the basic human rights and freedoms.

Articles 22-24 were devoted to the problem of the country's reunification.

The two German states, said Article 23, solemnly declare that they will never resort to force or threat of force to achieve the unification of Germany. "The two German states," Article 22 said, "like the Allied and United powers, consider the present treaty as an important contribution to the reunification of Germany in accordance with the national aspirations of the German people and the interests of security in Europe and the rest of the world."

Article 25 provided for a normalisation of the situation in West Berlin.

In accordance with the military provisions, the country would have national armed forces necessary for defence. Under Article 28 it was not to produce, acquire or experiment with nuclear weapons and other means of mass annihilation, rockets, bombers and submarines. Foreign troops were to be withdrawn from its territory and foreign military bases were to be dismantled.

Special articles were devoted to the development of Germany's peacetime economy. Article 32, for one, stressed

¹ Under international law, the return by one state to another of property unlawfully seized in war.

that no restrictions would be placed on the development of a peaceful economy furthering the welfare of the German nation. Other articles regulated various questions concerning property, claims, and the like, which had arisen as a result of the war.

In short, a peace treaty concluded on the basis of the Soviet proposals would have written *finis* to the Second World War and legitimated the existing post-war situation in Europe. It would have formalised the present German frontiers, normalised the situation in West Berlin and paved the way for rapprochement and close collaboration between the two German states.

Soviet Proposal on Normalising the Situation in West Berlin

As we have said, the Soviet proposals on the German problem provided for the normalisation of the situation in West Berlin. The question of eliminating the surviving occupation regime in West Berlin was first raised by the Soviet Union in November 1958.

The governments of the United States, Britain and France had violated the quadrilateral agreements on Germany. Having frustrated the fulfilment of the key provisions of the Potsdam Agreements, they had thereby forfeited their right to stay in West Berlin. Western defiance of the Potsdam Agreements undermined quadrilateral cooperation on matters concerning Germany by such acts as the establishment of Bizonia (1946) and Trizonia (1948); the separate currency reform in the FRG, which was also applied to West Berlin; the institution of a separate magistrature in West Berlin (1948); the tripartite "occupation status" imposed on the West Berlin population, which juridically perpetuated the partition of Berlin (1949 and 1955); the Paris Agreements on the rearmament of the FRG and its admission to NATO (1954).

In notes on the Berlin question to the governments of the United States, Britain and France, dated November 27, 1958, the Soviet Union pointed out their gross violations of the Potsdam Agreements, and suggested that

the situation be normalised by converting West Berlin into an independent political unit.

The Soviet Government suggested that the actual and juridical situation existing in West Berlin be taken as the point of departure. As an independent political unit, West Berlin could, without any restrictions whatever, maintain and develop contacts with the outside world. The socio-political system and the internal order would be the business of its population. The territory of West Berlin would be demilitarised and no armed forces would be stationed there. West Berlin would no longer be used then for hostile activity against any state.

The Soviet Government stressed that in adjusting the West Berlin issue, the powers should respect and observe the sovereign rights of the GDR, which had announced its consent to subscribe to, and respect, the agreement on West Berlin.

The Soviet proposals did not prejudice anybody's interests or rights. The Soviet Union wanted the peaceful settlement of the German problem, including the problem of West Berlin, to be achieved with consideration for the interests of both sides. The Soviet Government said it was willing to negotiate the matter at any time, provided the statesmen of the United States, Britain and France would not use the talks to delay the conclusion of a German peace treaty.

Again, the Western powers dealt negatively with the constructive Soviet proposals. Their replies were impregnated with the cold war spirit and the policy "from positions of strength". They declared concerning West Berlin that they would, with all appropriate means, maintain communications with the western sectors of Berlin. Yet, when world opinion responded positively to the new Soviet peace move, the three governments had no choice but to agree to negotiate and convene a four-power Foreign Ministers' conference.

Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers, 1959

The Conference of the Foreign Ministers of the USSR, USA, Britain and France convened in Geneva from May to August 1959 (with an interval). The concluding com-

munique said "the positions of both sides on certain points became closer". All the same, no agreement was reached. The Western powers did not want to conclude a peace treaty with the two German states. They had no wish to eliminate the dangerous seat of tension in West Berlin, and did not want a détente in Europe.

The important feature of the 1959 Geneva Conference was that representatives of the GDR and FRG participated for the first time in debating questions related to the German problem. This was a result of persevering Soviet efforts and public demands in the GDR, FRG and other countries. In other words, the West was compelled to recognise the German Democratic Republic de facto. The GDR delegation, unlike that of the FRG, made a positive contribution to the work of the conference.

The Geneva Conference showed, too, that the policy "from positions of strength" pursued against the socialist countries had collapsed, and that the imperialists were compelled to agree to negotiate vital international issues.

SOVIET EFFORTS TO PROMOTE AN INTERNATIONAL DÉTENTE, DISARMAMENT AND CO-OPERATION IN THE LATE 50s AND EARLY 60s

Soviet Proposals on General and Complete Disarmament

The economic upswing in the socialist countries, epitomised by Soviet superiority over the United States in some scientific and technical fields and the triumphant Soviet breakthrough into outer space had the effect of elevating the prestige of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community.

Besides, the 13 years of cold war, the cost of which exceeded US expenditures during the Second World War by 50 per cent, revealed plainly that the imperialist attempts to talk and act "from positions of strength" had no future. America's lag behind the Soviet Union in several key branches of military engineering made it clear that the strategico-military doctrines, on which the policy "from positions of strength" rested, had collapsed. The people of the United States had come to the dangerous

point where the adventurism of their policy-makers could precipitate a national catastrophe.

In the circumstances, the dynamic foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries exercised a strong influence on the general situation. Popular support for the Soviet policy of peace exercised a definitive influence on both the foreign and domestic policy of the principal Western powers. Statesmen could no longer ignore this fact, as shown, among other things, by the visit to the Soviet Union of Britain's Prime Minister Harold Macmillan (February-March 1959).

The Soviet-British negotiations in Moscow helped to elucidate the positions of the two sides, which was in itself a useful thing. The Soviet Government was eager to find solutions for the various acute European problems conforming equally to the interests of the Soviet and British peoples.

An understanding was reached to expand scientific, technical and cultural exchanges. This was a good start in developing relations between the two countries. Both governments agreed that the negotiations should continue.

Contacts and mutual visits of statesmen had a favourable effect on Soviet-American relations as well and paved the way for a meeting of the Heads of Government of the two Great Powers.

The visit to the United States of a Soviet Government delegation headed by Nikita Khrushchov, then Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, took place in September 1959. Soviet delegates spoke over the radio and television and met representatives of various sections of the American public.

Speaking at a session of the UN General Assembly, during his stay in the United States, the Head of the Soviet Government submitted on behalf of the USSR an important proposal on general and complete disarmament.

The results of the Soviet-American negotiations were outlined in a joint communique published on September 28, 1959. Highly important was the agreed proposition that "all outstanding international questions should be settled not by the application of force but by peaceful means through negotiation". The Soviet Government advocated the principle of negotiation as the most suit-

able method of resolving questions in dispute. Now, for the first time since the war, United States leaders accepted this principle too, thereby publicly admitting the collapse of their policy "from positions of strength". A new Heads of Government conference was agreed upon.

At the same time, the Soviet-American negotiations revealed all too clearly that the US Government was evading a conclusive discussion of the more acute international problems and did not wish to hammer out mutually acceptable solutions. President Eisenhower declined to discuss the Soviet proposal on general and complete disarmament and, also, opposed the conclusion of a German peace treaty. He tried to prevail on the Soviet Union to sign an agreement perpetuating the abnormal situation in West Berlin. The Soviet negotiators rejected this idea. The two sides agreed, however, that negotiations of the specific question of Berlin had to be reopened and that they should not be dragged out indefinitely.

The two sides reached an understanding on increasing trade and cultural exchanges.

The Soviet visit to the United States was an indication of the mounting international prestige of the USSR and of its readiness to improve relations with the United States on the basis of a mutual acknowledgement that interference in the affairs of other peoples is intolerable and that the legitimate interests of each side have to be respected.

The Soviet disarmament initiative was received enthusiastically all over the world. The futility of the past years of negotiation, which had run into a dead end due to the Western attitude, necessitated a new approach. A lever had to be found that could end mankind's drift towards a world war.

The Soviet Government came to the conclusion that general and complete disarmament would lead out of the cul-de-sac. In a declaration dated September 18, 1959, the USSR stated that it was convinced there was a chance to prevent the development of society along the path that had already led to two world wars.

The programme of general and complete disarmament put forward by the Soviet Government listed a series of specific measures:

1. Disbandment of all armed forces (ground troops, navies, air forces) and a ban on restoring them in any shape or form.

2. Destruction of all types of arms and depots (warships, warplanes, etc.), total prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, destruction of nuclear stockpiles, termination of the manufacture, and destruction of all types of rocket missiles and means of chemical and bacteriological warfare. Cessation of war production.

3. Dismantlement of all types of war bases in foreign territory (infantry, naval and air) and of all installations for the launching of rockets.

4. Termination of military training and repeal of military service in any shape or form. Banning of war propaganda and militarist education of the youth.

5. Abolition of war ministries, general staffs and other military and para-military organisations.

6. Termination of the allocation of funds for military purposes in any shape or form.

7. Issue of laws stipulating drastic punishment for the violation of any of the aforesaid measures.

The states would be allowed to maintain strictly limited contingents of police (militia) armed with light firearms to maintain public order and protect citizens.

The Soviet Government suggested that the programme of general and complete disarmament be implemented in four years, and divided the above measures into three stages.

The first stage would see the reduction of armed forces, armaments, and all machines of war.

The armed forces of the USSR, USA and CPR would be reduced to 1,700,000 each, and those of Great Britain and France to 650,000 each. The numerical strength of other national armies would also be reduced to agreed strength.

Armaments were to be reduced to a point corresponding to the fixed strength of the armed forces.

In the second stage, the nations were to complete the disbandment of the armed forces, dismantle war bases, withdraw and dissolve troops and other military personnel stationed in foreign territories.

Nuclear weapons and rocket missiles, and the property of the air forces, were to be destroyed in the third stage,

followed by the destruction of all the remaining arms, the abolition of war production, the dissolution of military and para-military institutions, and the termination of allocations for military purposes.

The Soviet declaration suggested that funds thus freed be used to lower or totally lift taxes, to subsidise the national economy and to render material and technical assistance to economically underdeveloped countries.

An international control organ, on which all states would be represented, was to see to the timely execution of the disarmament measures. Its personnel would be selected on an international basis by fair geographical distribution.

The international organ would possess all material facilities to exercise strict control, the extent of control and inspection corresponding to the specific extent of the stage-by-stage disarmament. The functions and powers of the control organ should conform to the character of the disarmament measures.

Once general and complete disarmament was completed, the Soviet plan said, the international control organ would have free access to all objects of control.

This, in brief outline, was the new disarmament programme proposed by the Soviet Government. It had many advantages. For one thing, the advocates of the arms race had maintained that specific disarmament measures would unbalance the correlation of forces in the world and some states would be placed at a disadvantage in ensuring their security. The general and complete disarmament proposals put all countries on an equal footing and ruled out any and all advantages.

The new approach to the disarmament problem made it possible to settle the question of control, which Western diplomats listed as their main objection to disarmament.

The Soviet Union stands for disarmament under strict international control, but opposes control without disarmament. Western diplomats, for their part, always contrived to make disarmament measures conditional on such control, which other countries could not countenance in view of the cold war and arms race.

All these difficulties were removed by the plan for general and complete disarmament, for the countries would

then have nothing to hide from each other. Neither would they have to fear that information collected by controllers may be used against them.

It was much more likely, too, that violations of the agreement would be detected at once, because it is much easier to check complete disarmament than to control partial reductions of armed forces.

General and complete disarmament ruled out the dangers implicit in keeping nuclear weapons, even if a country attempted to keep them secretly, for all technical facilities adaptable for the delivery of nuclear arms would be kept under observation by the international control organ.

The Soviet programme for general and complete disarmament ushered in a new stage in the struggle to end the arms race. It was designed to deliver mankind from the increasing burden of war expenditure and the danger of destructive wars.

The Soviet programme of a world without war was backed by the socialist countries and all decent people on earth. Afghanistan, India, Indonesia, the United Arab Republic, Ghana, Guinea and many other countries publicly announced their approval of the Soviet proposal. The imperialist powers, too, were compelled by public opinion to declare their agreement with it.

On November 20, 1959, the General Assembly unanimously passed a resolution approving the idea of general and complete disarmament.

US Aggressive Groups Scuttle Paris Summit Conference

The beginning of 1960 was marked by a certain improvement of the international climate.

In late March and early April 1960, a Soviet Government delegation visited France. The Soviet Government had accepted the invitation of the French President, because it wished to make the most of all opportunities of strengthening peace and improving mutual understanding between the USSR and France. Besides, the visit was likely to be useful in view of the forthcoming Summit Conference.

A joint Soviet-French communique of April 3 noted that the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and the President of the French Republic had agreed that international matters should be resolved without resort to force, through negotiation. They pointed out that an agreed resolution of the question of a German peace treaty and of West Berlin was highly important.

The dynamic Soviet foreign policy offered favourable prospects for a Summit Conference, on which the nations pinned their hopes.

If the Western powers had followed the example set by the USSR and showed the same degree of willingness to settle questions in dispute, the Paris Conference of Heads of Government, scheduled for the middle of May 1960, could have been an important milestone in international relations. But the reactionary rulers of the United States were bent on preventing a relaxation of international tension. The ending of the cold war was, they thought, likely to sharpen contradictions between the Western powers, muted by the anti-Soviet hysteria, and to imperil the ramified system of blocs and pacts which secured a dominant position for the United States within the imperialist camp. The monopolists feared they would be deprived of the immense profits they received from the arms race. Dreading the possible improvement of relations between East and West, the cold war architects went to absurd lengths in their various contentions. Any relaxation of tension, the *New York Post* wrote, for one, in March 1960, is no more than a "method" whereby Moscow hoped "to prepare us for burial".

Washington policy-makers set out to scuttle the Summit Conference at any price, or at least to obstruct the adoption of agreed solutions. US diplomats carried through a series of provocative manoeuvres. The so-called Norstad Plan was published in March 1960, providing for a nuclear strike force that would include the Bundeswehr, in Western Europe. The NATO and CENTO Councils emphasised the alleged necessity of building up the war potential and of a "tough line" vis-à-vis the socialist countries. US statesmen, such as Vice-President Richard Nixon and State Secretary Christian Herter, made slanderous public statements in an effort to fling the world back to the

worst days of the cold war, and Eisenhower lined up with them publicly.

The culminating point in this firebrand campaign was reached when an American spy-plane invaded Soviet air space in the early morning of May 1. The spy-pilot was to cross Soviet territory from the Pamirs to the Kola Peninsula at a high altitude and photograph military and industrial objectives.

Similar aggressive acts had been committed by the United States before. Washington always made formal excuses and attempted to deny the incursions. Yet on May 1, the spy-plane was shot down by Soviet rocket troops near Sverdlovsk.

In an official statement, the US State Department maintained that the plane had been conducting meteorological research in the upper layers of the atmosphere near the Turkish-Soviet border when the pilot had allegedly gone off course due to trouble with the oxygen supply.

The Soviet Government replied on May 7 that the American pilot had been captured alive, that parts of the downed aircraft had survived, and that a film had been recovered from the wreckage with photographs of certain regions of the USSR, together with a tape which had recorded the signals of Soviet ground radar stations. A competent commission had determined to the utmost degree of certainty that the aircraft was a specially equipped air spy. Furthermore, pilot Francis G. Powers had admitted that he had been ordered to collect information about Soviet guided missiles and radar stations.

With its back to the wall, the US Government replied baldly that spy flights were "necessitated by considerations of national defence" and would therefore be continued. This was tantamount to declaring espionage, subversion and violations of sovereignty and of the immunity of foreign frontiers as part of official United States policy—the peak of perfidy in relations between states in peacetime.

The spy flight had been timed to coincide with the Summit Conference and conceived as a demonstration of US military power. It was a method whereby the US hoped to obtain unilateral concessions from the Soviet Union. The Soviet Government thwarted this manoeuvre. At a

preliminary meeting of the Heads of Government in Paris on May 16, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR declared that the Soviet Government was prepared to participate in the conference and apply every effort to further its success, but that it saw no prospects for fruitful negotiations until the United States promised to cease violating the frontiers of the Soviet Union and to punish the persons guilty of such action.

The United States declined to accept this perfectly legitimate demand and thus made the conference impossible. By so doing, the US Government assumed full responsibility for the collapse of the Paris talks.

The provocative conduct of the US policy-makers evoked indignation among all peace-loving peoples. Within the United States, too, discontent ran high.

New Soviet Disarmament Proposals (June 1960)

Despite the intensively aggressive trend of US foreign policy and the provocative sallies of the cold warriors, the Soviet Government worked on perseveringly for a settlement of the more acute and important international problems through negotiation in an effort to consolidate world peace and security. The Soviet Government believed that the objective march of history, the further tilting of the balance of strength in favour of the socialist camp, would facilitate the achievement of the goal set at the 21st Congress of the CPSU—to exclude war from the life of society. In a new disarmament move on June 2, 1960, the USSR published the Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament worked out for the Paris Summit Conference and based on the Soviet Declaration on Disarmament. In its new proposal, the Soviet Government went much of the way in meeting previous Western objections.

The provisions differed somewhat from the plan advanced by the USSR at the 14th UN General Assembly in 1959. To begin with, the order of the measures by stages was changed. The wish expressed by de Gaulle that general and complete disarmament should begin, in the very first stage, with the banning and destruction of means of

delivering nuclear weapons, was accepted all the way. The Soviet Union, which had superior means of delivery (intercontinental ballistic missiles), showed its readiness thereby to give up an important military advantage.

However, the fact that the United States had built up a ring of military bases with aircraft and rockets capable of delivering nuclear warheads round the frontiers of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, had to be reckoned with. The new Soviet proposal, therefore, envisaged that foreign military bases would be abolished, and troops would be withdrawn from foreign territory, simultaneously with the destruction of nuclear delivery means (rockets, planes, warships, submarines, artillery systems, and the like).

Since the Western powers had previously objected to a major reduction of armed forces and conventional arms in the first stage of disarmament, these measures were assigned to the second stage in the new proposal. The final disbandment of the armed forces of all countries was to occur in the third stage.

Secondly, guarantees were provided for against the possibility of aggression in a disarmed world. At the 14th General Assembly spokesmen of the smaller countries had voiced apprehensions as to their security. Exploiting their anxiety, Western diplomats suggested forming an "international armed force". The Soviet Government acceded to this wish in its new plan, with the reservation that it should not lead to the development of a big army which could be used for imperialist purposes. The Soviet Union suggested that units of the police (militia) remaining at the disposal of the various countries would, whenever necessary, be made available to the Security Council. They should be used solely to maintain peace, and not to settle scores with peoples struggling for their independence and social progress, or for interference in the internal affairs of states.

Thirdly, the general disarmament programme was to be effected in four years or any other agreed term (because the four-year term did not suit the Western powers).

Fourthly, a more detailed procedure of control in each of the three stages was worked out for the new project. An international control body was envisaged, competent to

deal with all disarmament measures, its powers expanding as disarmament progressed. This frustrated the vicious misinterpretations the Western powers spread, alleging that the Soviet position on control was vague and its recommendations insufficiently concrete.

The Soviet proposal was submitted to the 10-Nation Disarmament Committee formed in 1959 of five socialist countries—the USSR, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Bulgaria—and five Western countries—the USA, Britain, France, Italy and Canada.

USSR Champions Peace at 15th UN General Assembly (1960-61)

The growing might of the socialist community, the emergence of new sovereign states in the world arena and the emergence of the third stage of the general crisis of capitalism were weighty factors influencing the contemporary international situation, and did not fail to affect the United Nations. Before the 15th session of the General Assembly opened it had consisted of 82 countries. Another 17 countries were admitted to the United Nations during the session. As a result, the balance within the organisation tilted substantially in favour of the peace-loving forces.

This was already made clearly perceptible at the 15th General Assembly, which won a special place in the history of the United Nations. The session opened on September 20, 1960, and closed on April 22, 1961. Heads of State and Government of more than 30 countries came to New York at the call of the Soviet Government. The session discussed the most urgent and vital problems of our time.

1. The question of general and complete disarmament. On September 23, the Soviet delegation submitted to the General Assembly the Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament. The project was based on the Soviet proposals of June 2, 1960. However, it took into account the suggestion of the Western powers that nuclear disarmament should be combined with a reduction of armed forces and conventional arms in the very first

stage. The Soviet project provided that, alongside the destruction of the means of nuclear delivery and the dismantlement of foreign war bases, a considerable reduction of armed forces should take place simultaneously in the first stage.

"The armed forces of all states," said Clause 2, "shall be reduced to the fixed strength, with the armed forces of the USA and the USSR being reduced to not more than 1,700,000 men. The conventional arms and ammunition thus made redundant shall be destroyed, while war machines shall be either destroyed or used for peaceful purposes. The military expenditures of states shall be reduced accordingly."

The Soviet general and complete disarmament plan was a detailed programme resolving a complex and pressing contemporary problem. It closely combined strict international control with practical measures designed to reduce, and later fully eliminate, nuclear and conventional arms and armed forces.

The Western powers again tried to use the question of control in erecting artificial barriers. The Soviet delegation countered this move by making an exhaustive exposition of the Soviet stand on this score. The Soviet Union, it said, is prepared to sign a treaty on disarmament and the destruction of arms and to let the United States work out the pertinent system of control over the destruction of arms, over disarmament.

Since the disarmament problem was vitally important for all peoples, the Soviet Government suggested that neutralist states, such as India, Indonesia, the United Arab Republic, Ghana and Mexico, be represented on the working organ of the General Assembly (the 10-Nation Committee).

The Soviet proposals were backed by the delegations of the socialist countries, who made a number of supplementary suggestions. The Polish delegation suggested forming a special UN committee to examine the probable consequences of the use of nuclear weapons. Rumania renewed her proposal to conclude a treaty for collective co-operation and security and to turn the Balkans and the Adriatic area into a denuclearised zone free from foreign military bases and rocket-launching pads.

The Afro-Asian states were highly articulate on disarmament. They welcomed the idea of general and complete disarmament and supported the Soviet Union in a number of important aspects (dismantlement of war bases and control). A group of neutralist states, with India at their head, submitted a draft of directives for general and complete disarmament. In general terms, this draft conformed to the set goal and was, therefore, backed by the Soviet Union.

The United States and its bloc partners opposed the draft resolution of the 12 neutral countries. Thus, the socialist countries and a big group of neutral states formed a united front. For the first time in history, India, Indonesia, the United Arab Republic, Ghana, Morocco and other formerly dependent countries came out openly against the position of the imperialist powers with regard to disarmament.

Although the Western spokesmen said they also wanted disarmament, they evaded an earnest discussion of the matter and tried to submerge the Soviet proposals in a flood of hastily fabricated projects which, in effect, envisaged control over armaments rather than disarmament.

Although the disarmament problem was not resolved at the 15th General Assembly, the very fact that it was discussed was a distinct success for the Soviet peace policy, for the Soviet proposals had thus been brought to public notice and generated attention for this most important of all contemporary problems, enhancing the prestige of the USSR as the leading force in the struggle for world peace and security.

2. The question of abolishing the colonial system of imperialism. On September 23, 1960, the Soviet Government submitted to the General Assembly the draft of a Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which envisaged the immediate and unconditional abolition of colonialism. On December 14, the General Assembly adopted the Declaration as worded by 43 Afro-Asian countries, which reflected the basic principles of the Soviet project. This event of immense historical impact was made possible by the initiative of the Soviet Union, by its consistent and persevering struggle for the freedom and equality of peoples.

3. The question of modifying the structure of the executive bodies of the United Nations. At a plenary sitting of the General Assembly on October 3, 1960, the Soviet delegation raised the question of bringing the structure of the United Nations into line with the world situation. It called attention to the following.

More than 15 years had passed since the founding of the United Nations. More than 1,000 million people (of the world population of 3,000 million) live in socialist countries. Young states adhering to a neutralist policy, whose population amounts to more than 1,000 million, had emerged in Asia and Africa. Yet the structure of the United Nations did not reflect these historic changes. A group of imperialist and colonial powers headed by the United States predominated. It used the United Nations in its own interests, while ignoring and prejudicing the rights of the socialist and neutralist states. The structure of the Security Council, too, was inconsistent with the situation prevailing in the world. When the United Nations was founded, five states—the USSR, China, the USA, Britain and France—were considered the only Great Powers. Today, such countries as India and Indonesia had to be included in their number. The rights of the People's Republic of China were being ignored. The fact that the executive organ of the United Nations, the Secretariat, which handled all current work between General Assembly sessions, was an obedient tool of the imperialists, had a particularly pernicious effect on world affairs.

In a nutshell, the principles of the sovereign equality of states and equal representation not only of individual states, but also of groups of states, which are fundamental and are set out in the UN Charter, were being grossly violated.

The stand of the Soviet delegation at the 15th General Assembly stimulated the forces of peace, heightened the vigilance of peoples, and won new friends for the socialist camp. The discussion of the items on the agenda showed a drop in the influence of the imperialist powers, a rise in the prestige of the USSR and the other socialist states, and an increase in the role and activity of the young Asian and African states.

The rapidly growing might and influence of the world socialist system, the determined struggle of the socialist countries for peace and international co-operation and the active participation of the young Asian, African and Latin American states in international life, cumulatively compelled the Western policy-makers to be more realistic in their assessment of current affairs and of the new relation of forces. The late US President John F. Kennedy was one of the men who showed such political insight.

In mid-1961, he announced his readiness to meet Nikita Khrushchov, the then Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

The meeting took place in Vienna, June 2-4. Opinions were exchanged concerning Soviet-American relations, discontinuance of nuclear testing, disarmament, the German problem and the question of Laos.

It will be recalled that the three years of negotiation in Geneva of the nuclear test ban by the USSR, the USA and Britain had yielded no results. The number of inspections necessary to verify observance of the agreement banning nuclear tests, the question of control and the structure of the control bodies were the chief bones of contention.

The USSR suggested that control over the fulfilment of the test ban treaty should be exercised by representatives of the three groups of states who were to adopt agreed decisions only.

The Soviet proposals guaranteed equal rights to all signatories and ruled out abuses on the part of the control body. But the Western diplomats, who contended that the Soviet Union sought a position of advantage, tried to impose a "neutral figure" as the sole interpreter, which would enable them to gather intelligence unmolested in Soviet territory. It stands to reason that the USSR could not consent to this condition.

At the Vienna negotiations the Soviet Government recommended settling the two problems, that of the test ban and of disarmament, simultaneously and inter-relatedly. Under general and complete disarmament the question of security would assume a somewhat different

complexion; there would be no armies and no danger of one state attacking another. Then, the Soviet Government would be able to consent to the control proposals of the Western powers.

A Soviet memorandum on a German peace treaty pointed out that the "USSR considers it necessary to formalise the post-war situation in Europe, to legally finalise the immunity of the existing German frontiers and to normalise the situation in West Berlin upon a sensible combination of the standpoints of all sides". The memorandum stressed that it was farthest from the thoughts of the Soviet Government to prejudice the interests of the United States or any other West European country.

The Soviet Government again showed its desire to promote peace and international co-operation. Some people in Washington misunderstood the Soviet attitude. They raised their voices again in favour of a "tough line" and a policy "from positions of strength". Instead of a search for mutually acceptable compromises, these inept politicians called for intractability.

Actions of the GDR Government, August 13, 1961

Countering the legitimate desire of the Soviet Union and the other peace-loving states to conclude a German peace treaty, the United States and its NATO allies created a highly precarious situation in the summer and autumn of 1961. The US President asked Congress for an additional \$3,500 million to step up the arms drive. New contingents of servicemen were drafted into the army. The troops of the aggressive blocs held manoeuvres. Provocation from West Berlin and FRG became more frequent. War hysteria was being artificially generated in the United States and other NATO countries. The Western propaganda machine spread the slanderous invention that the Soviet proposal of a German peace treaty and of normalising the situation in West Berlin imperilled the West. "The imperialists," said the Resolution of the 22nd Congress of the CPSU on the Central Committee Report, "have created a dangerous situation in the heart of

Europe, threatening war in reply to the proposal of the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries to eliminate the remnants of the Second World War, conclude a peace treaty with Germany and normalise the West Berlin situation."¹

In the circumstances, the Soviet Government was compelled to take additional measures in order to reinforce the defences of the USSR. Similar steps were also made by the other socialist countries and joint measures were undertaken by mutual agreement within the framework of the Warsaw Treaty organisation.

Yet the Soviet Government did not give up its attempts to achieve a peace settlement in Germany jointly with the Western powers. Early in August 1961, it sent notes to the governments of the United States, Britain and France, and a memorandum to the Federal Republic of Germany. These documents contained an appeal for joint efforts to achieve the conclusion of a German peace treaty.

At the same time, the First Secretaries of the Central Committees of Communist and Workers' Parties of Warsaw Treaty member-countries conferred in Moscow on matters concerning the conclusion of a German peace treaty. The conference authorised the competent bodies to frame necessary political and economic measures securing the conclusion of a peace treaty and the implementation of its provisions, including the question of West Berlin. The members of the conference expressed their readiness to work for a peaceful German settlement in conjunction with the United States, Britain and France.

The *Tribune*, a British weekly, wrote in August 1961:

"There is no reason, in fact, for any Western leader to lose his temper. The West is not being challenged to a third world war. It is being invited, by a former ally, to end the second. This objective is as much in Western interests as those of the Soviet Union."

World opinion denounced the war hysteria fanned by the imperialists and the policy of brinkmanship pursued by the United States and its NATO partners.

But the sabre-rattling did not stop. Imperialist war preparations were coupled with subversive activities from

¹ *The Road to Communism*, p. 417.

the territory of West Berlin against the GDR and other socialist countries. After due consultations with the other members of the Warsaw Treaty, the Council of Ministers of the GDR passed a decision to institute control and to guard the border between the GDR capital and West Berlin as of August 13, 1961, that is, to enforce the procedure usually observed along the borders of all sovereign states. This measure struck a painful blow at the aggressive forces. Helped and supported by the other countries of the socialist community, the German Democratic Republic erected what Walter Ulbricht, the First Secretary of the CC SUPG, described as a "protective wall against fascism" round West Berlin, which made the frontiers of the German Democratic Republic secure against all unwanted incursions.

The Western powers, who flung threats at the German Democratic Republic and other socialist countries, continued to raise the tension. But their military demonstrations and provocations in the "front-line city" did not yield the expected results. The wave of war hysteria in the imperialist camp smashed against the unity and solidarity of the socialist states and all the peace-loving forces. The opponents of a German peace treaty suffered a serious setback. Western leaders and the bourgeois press admitted it. Walter Lippmann, one of the leading US journalists, wrote in the *New York Herald Tribune* that West Berlin "is very much less than it was before the entry point of Western propaganda and intelligence".

International reaction thus suffered another failure in the cold war against the socialist countries. An extremely important step in reinforcing the positions of peace and socialism in the heart of Europe was accomplished thereby by the joint efforts of the socialist countries.

16th General Assembly and the Disarmament Problem

The 16th General Assembly, which opened in the autumn of 1961, gave the Soviet Union and other socialist countries a fresh opportunity to work jointly for the solution of the disarmament problem. Disarmament was the focal point in the work of the 16th General Assembly (September 1961-February 1962).

Most of the speakers in the general debate sided with the Soviet point of view that the important problem could be solved only on the basis of general and complete disarmament. Even the Western delegations, who had priorly argued against the necessity of a programme of general and complete disarmament, no longer objected.

Again, the Soviet delegates submitted the draft of the Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament (of September 23, 1960) and a Memorandum on Measures to Ease International Tension. Besides, a joint Soviet-American Statement of Agreed Principles for Disarmament Negotiations, drawn up during an exchange of opinion in the summer and autumn of 1961, was made public. The statement pointed out that the purpose of the negotiations was to reach agreement ensuring that "disarmament is general and complete and war is no longer an instrument for settling international problems". The programme of general and complete disarmament, it said, is to contain provisions on the disbandment of armed forces, abolition of military institutions, including bases and stockpiles of weapons of mass annihilation, and on the cessation of their manufacture and the destruction of means of delivery. The statement noted that all disarmament measures must proceed under strict international control.

The 16th UN General Assembly unanimously recommended to base subsequent negotiations on these principles.

American and British diplomacy was eager to create the impression that the Soviet refusal of "active control" was the sole obstacle to disarmament. The Soviet delegation showed that this contention was groundless. It pointed out that the USSR is prepared to accept all proposals for control and inspection, provided the Western powers accept the programme of general and complete disarmament, but would never agree to control over armaments, because this was tantamount to legalising espionage and, consequently, to increasing the danger of war.

Despite their crafty demagogy, the United States and its bloc partners were isolated and unable to prevent the General Assembly from passing positive decisions. This was due notably to the coinciding stands of the

socialist states and the independent Asian and African countries.

The General Assembly resolution of December 20, 1961, recommended basing disarmament negotiations on the principles thrashed out jointly by the USSR and the USA. On a Soviet proposal, representatives of neutralist states (India, Burma, the United Arab Republic, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Brazil, Mexico and Sweden) were included in the formerly 10-Nation Committee, consisting of diplomats of the socialist and imperialist countries. It became the 18-Nation Committee, a working organ for the conduct of disarmament negotiations, which the General Assembly instructed to frame a general and complete disarmament agreement under effective international control in the shortest possible time on the basis of the already approved principles.

A declaration on the banning of the use of nuclear weapons, passed at the proposal of a group of Afro-Asian countries on November 24, 1961, and the decision to proclaim Africa an atom-free zone, were of great significance. A resolution was also passed concerning measures to prevent further proliferation of nuclear weapons, calling on the non-nuclear countries to refrain from manufacturing or acquiring nuclear arms and to prohibit the import or stationing of foreign nuclear weapons in their territory in the future.

Soviet Proposals Submitted to the 18-Nation Committee (March 1962)

The first session of the 18-Nation Disarmament Committee opened in Geneva on March 14, 1962. It consisted of representatives of the socialist community (the USSR, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Bulgaria), the Western powers (the USA, Britain, France, Italy and Canada), and the neutralist states (Burma, Brazil, India, Mexico, Nigeria, the United Arab Republic, Sweden and Ethiopia). The Soviet Union submitted a draft of the Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament Under Strict International Control, which embodied the ideas expressed by the Soviet delegation at the 15th UN General

Assembly and conformed with the principles approved at the 16th General Assembly as a basis for negotiation.

The Soviet proposals, as we have already said, envisaged general and complete disarmament in the course of four years. All disarmament measures were to be effected in three stages and so distributed as to rule out military advantages at any time for any of the disarming states. An international control body within the United Nations framework, provided with all the necessary means of control, was to begin functioning as soon as disarmament began.

The Soviet representatives on the Disarmament Committee suggested a logical and effective method, whereby the articles of the Soviet project would be discussed successively in conjunction with amendments and addenda submitted by other participants. The concrete provisions of the Treaty could thus have been agreed step by step.

The delegations of the United States and other NATO countries on the Committee tried to impose a general discussion of the various aspects of the disarmament problem and meant to leave the framing of concrete commitments and provisions well enough alone. The US diplomats again raised the question of general principles and specific technical details, aiming to divert the Committee from its main purpose—the framing of the Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament. The same aim was pursued by the Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World, submitted by the United States. Belying its name, the Outline contained prolific references to the purposes, tasks and methods of disarmament, yet evaded the rockbottom question—the conclusion of a treaty and implementation of disarmament in a strictly specified time. The authors of the Outline sought to plan disarmament in a manner that would give them the maximum military advantage and control over the armed forces and defence industries of the USSR. In effect, the US proposal retreated from the jointly framed and agreed Soviet-American principles approved by the 16th UN General Assembly.

Modern science is capable of detecting explosions of nuclear weapons quite easily by national means of control. So the Soviet Union suggested mutual control based

on such national means once nuclear tests were banned. On the pretext that broad international observation is absolutely essential, the United States and Britain torpedoed a test ban agreement and sought to gain a "legal right" to continue the nuclear arms race. While the negotiations proceeded in Geneva, the United States set off a new series of nuclear test explosions in the atmosphere.

The American and British spokesmen also rejected the compromise proposals of the eight neutralist members of the 18-Nation Committee, made on April 16, 1962. These suggested that national means of control be supplemented by an international commission of highly competent scientists, who would enforce control on a purely scientific, rather than political, basis. The proposals did not envisage obligatory on-the-spot inspections, but did not rule them out in specific cases on the invitation of the state in whose territory phenomena had occurred, whose origin was insufficiently clear to the international commission. The USSR agreed to treat these provisions as a basis for further talks.

US nuclear blasts in the Pacific Ocean defied world opinion. The new aggressive act touched off a fresh and still more dangerous round in the nuclear arms race and led inevitably to a deterioration on the international scene, hindering a solution of the disarmament problem. The Soviet Union was naturally compelled to reinforce its security and also carry through tests of new types of nuclear weapons.

The responsibility for this forced Soviet action falls squarely on the United States and its bloc partners.

Yet the Soviet Government would not abandon its efforts to achieve a rapid and effective solution of the disarmament problem as a whole. It made new proposals, in which it took account of some of the Western wishes, both to the 18-Nation Committee and the 17th UN General Assembly.

When the negotiations in the 18-Nation Committee were resumed (in the middle of July), the Soviet Government agreed to the US proposal of stage-by-stage arms reduction. It was also prepared to accept the proposals designed to reduce the danger of an accidental outbreak of

war—exchange of military missions, establishment of swift and reliable communications between Heads of Government and the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The Soviet Government was also amenable to a longer term for general and complete disarmament and to limiting the strength of the armed forces of the USSR and USA at the close of the first period to 1.9 million rather than 1.7 million men. Lastly, Soviet spokesmen at the 17th General Assembly announced that the Soviet draft of the Treaty was amended to allow the USSR and the USA to keep a strictly specified limited number of intercontinental and ground-to-air rockets until the end of the second stage of disarmament. The Western powers, it will be recalled, had argued that elimination of rocket weapons by the end of the first stage would "leave Europe unprotected" in the event of a war with conventional weapons.

The Soviet Union also suggested an agreement banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, under water and in outer space, provided the signatories undertook to continue negotiating a ban on underground tests. The Soviet Union welcomed the "black boxes" (automatic seismological stations) idea suggested at the Pugwash Conference as a means of test ban control. The USSR also consented to foreign specialists participating in the delivery of these stations, and in their installation and supervision. Last but not least, the Soviet Union went a long way in meeting the Western wish of inspections. The new concrete Soviet proposals concerned the regions in which automatic seismological stations could be dispositioned, and the quota and procedure of inspection.

The Soviet proposals were part of the Soviet Union's drive in behalf of lasting peace and international security. It was this that paved the way, despite the extremely slow pace of the negotiations due to the intractability of the Western powers, to agreement on general principles and to the formulation of the preamble and of some of the articles of the prospective disarmament treaty.

At the 17th General Assembly, the Soviet Union again put forward concrete proposals for the normalisation of international affairs. The Soviet delegation asked the Assembly to examine its project of converting to peaceful needs resources released through disarmament. This idea

won the support of other countries. An agreed draft was unanimously passed. The Soviet Union and the United States jointly submitted a resolution on international co-operation in the use of outer space for peaceful purposes, which was promptly approved by the UN General Assembly. General support was given, too, to the Soviet proposal that an international conference on trade be convened to promote world commerce on a basis of equality and mutual advantage, ending the policy of embargoes and discrimination, pursued by the imperialists against countries of the socialist community. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, conceived in the Soviet proposal, was held in Geneva from March to June 1964.

Soviet-American Exchanges of Opinion on the German Problem

The question of a German peace and normalisation of the situation in West Berlin was highly prominent in the Soviet efforts to relieve international tension. The firm stand of the Soviet Union and all the socialist countries finally compelled the opponents a peace settlement to consent to negotiations.

In the autumn of 1961, when the 16th UN General Assembly was in sitting, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko held talks with US State Secretary Dean Rusk and President John Kennedy and somewhat later, with British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan.

Soviet and American diplomats also met a few times in early 1962 and, among other things, discussed the German problem. The bilateral Soviet-American exchanges were picked up in summer in Geneva, at the time of talks over Laos, and in September-October 1962, during the 17th UN General Assembly.

The Soviet spokesmen stressed that conclusion of one peace treaty with the two German states would be the most effective way of settling the matter. Yet, they said, if the Western powers were reluctant, separate treaties could be signed with the GDR and FRG.

The exchange of opinion revealed that the positions of the USSR and USA had come somewhat closer in some

matters related to the elimination of the vestiges of war in Europe. Subsequently, however, the US Government gave way to the "wild men" and militarists, also the West German revenge-seekers, and embarked on the tactics of "interminable negotiation", submerging the question of a peace settlement. It became clear then that the imperialists were determined to preserve the occupation regime in West Berlin and that influential groups in the West, especially the United States and Bonn, were bent on exacerbating the international situation. An indication of this was furnished by the conclusion of a treaty by the FRG and France, and by the widely circulated plans of a multilateral NATO nuclear force.

In January 1963, France and West Germany concluded a treaty on military and political co-operation. Thereby, Bonn expected to erect a new alliance of the monopolies and militarists of the two countries against the socialist states and the forces of democracy and progress.

The West German rulers hoped France would help them to rearm and obtain atomic weapons. They were eager, moreover, to take advantage of the mounting contradictions between the leading NATO countries to strengthen their own position in that aggressive bloc and the other politico-military and economic unions of the West. France, too, was out to shore up her international position by means of the above treaty.

The Franco-West German treaty is a fresh token of the increasing imperialist contradictions, above all those between the United States and the West European countries. The treaty put the United States on its guard. Neither did it please Britain, which its rivals kept out of the Common Market. Bonn diplomacy, naturally, became much more active at the time, and the revanchist policies of the FRG Government much more distinct.

A Soviet note to the FRG Government dated February 5, 1963, pointed out that the Franco-West German treaty was "aimed at a further complication of the international situation, at fanning the contradictions over West Berlin and other seats of possible conflict, and at mining the approaches to problems long ripe for a solution, which other states are striving to solve".

Crisis in the Caribbean. USSR Acts to Preserve Peace

In the autumn of 1962 the US imperialists accentuated their aggressive attitude against Cuba and thereby precipitated an acute international crisis. The US President asked Congress for permission to call up 150,000 reservists. The Senate and the House of Representatives passed a joint resolution, stressing that the USA was determined to battle the Cuban revolution "by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms".

The Soviet Government wasted no time and took a public stand against this policy of aggression and provocation. A TASS statement of September 11 issued a stern warning that the US imperialist plan of an armed intervention against Cuba was fraught with the gravest of consequences to world peace. The statement stressed that anti-Cuban provocations could plunge the world into a universal nuclear war and reiterated the Soviet Government's support of the Cuban Republic.

In the circumstances, acting on the necessity of protecting the Cuban revolution, the governments of the Soviet Union and Cuba reached an understanding for Soviet medium-range rockets to be stationed in Cuba to repel imperialist aggression.

Yet the US imperialists kept hotting up the atmosphere. They massed large naval forces in the immediate proximity of Cuba and concentrated considerable air, air-borne and marine troops in a show of force. On October 22, 1962, President Kennedy announced a naval "quarantine" or, more precisely, a blockade of the Cuban Republic. The US armed forces, including troops stationed in Western Europe, the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean and the 7th Fleet based near Taiwan, were readied for action. As many as 183 warships with crews totalling 80,000 rode the seas near the Cuban shore. Something like 20 per cent of America's strategic air force, consisting of nuclear-armed warplanes, patrolled the skies round the clock. America's NATO allies, too, put their troops on a war footing. Pressured by the United States, some of the Latin American countries took part in the blockade of Cuba. The situation in the Caribbean was never more strained.

The Soviet Union had to face up to an extremely difficult and responsible decision. It was essential to act swiftly and reinforce the freedom and independence of Cuba and, at the same time, avert a world nuclear war.

The Soviet Union was compelled to alert its troops, strategic rocket force included. Similar alerts were effected also by the other Warsaw Treaty countries.

On October 23, 1962, the Soviet Government issued a special statement, warning the United States that it bore the responsibility for the future of peace, and said it was playing with fire recklessly. The statement said the Soviet Union would do everything in its power to avert aggression.

At the same time, the Soviet Government took action in the United Nations. Like the Cuban Government, the USSR raised the question of America's aggressive conduct before the Security Council. Responding to an appeal of the then Acting Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant, the Soviet Government consented to his mediation in an urgent accommodation of the crisis. The broad Soviet employment of diplomatic means to settle the Caribbean crisis was hailed by world opinion.

At the eleventh hour, the statesmen of the United States evidently realised the probable consequences of the conflict and ignored the bellicose calls of the "wild men". An understanding was reached through an exchange of messages by the Head of the Soviet Government and the US President. The United States promised not to invade Cuba and to restrain allied governments from aggression. The Soviet Government consented, for its part, to ship rockets and IL-28 bombers out of Cuba.

The US invasion of Cuba was thus averted and the international crisis, which was likely to touch off a world nuclear war, was eliminated. The most reckless extremist imperialist forces suffered yet another setback.

The Soviet Union backed the Cuban programme for a further normalisation of the situation in the Caribbean, announced on October 28. The programme covered the following five points:

termination of the economic blockade and all other measures of economic and commercial pressure sponsored by the United States against the Republic of Cuba;

termination of subversive activities, shipment and landing of arms and explosives by air and sea, of invasions of mercenaries, infiltration of spies and saboteurs, that is, of all acts performed from the territory of the United States and its accomplices;

termination of piratic raids from bases in the United States and Puerto Rico;

termination of incursions into the air space and territorial waters of the Cuban Republic by North American planes and ships;

dismantlement of the naval base in Guantanamo and the return to the Cuban Republic of this US-occupied territory.

The Caribbean crisis awakened mankind to the fact that it had no time to lose in solving the key problem of our time: war or no war? For most people living in the Western Hemisphere war had largely been an abstract conception. Now, the overwhelming majority became aware that a nuclear war was likely to involve all nations and states.

Moscow Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

The Soviet Government continued its unremitting efforts for the banning of nuclear weapons tests. In the summer of 1963, it came out with a new initiative. By that time drawn-out negotiations with the United States and Britain indicated that due to the Western attitude it was impossible to achieve agreement on a ban of all nuclear tests. The West wished to saddle the Soviet Union with a system of international control and inspection that would enable it to spy in Soviet territory.

Weighing the situation thoroughly, the Soviet Government, prompted by its sense of responsibility for the future of the peoples, suggested a ban on tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. The question of international control was thus eliminated, because the Western powers had already previously admitted that it was unnecessary.

The negotiations in Moscow from July 15 to 25 between representatives of the Soviet Union, the United States and Britain yielded an agreed text of a Treaty Banning Tests

of Nuclear Weapons in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water. The Treaty was signed in Moscow on August 5.

It stipulated that each of its signatories undertook to prohibit, to prevent and not to carry out any nuclear weapons test explosions, or any other nuclear explosions, at any place under its jurisdiction or control in the atmosphere, beyond its limits, including outer space, and under water, including territorial waters or high seas. Nuclear underground explosions were not banned, but partially restricted, inasmuch as the Treaty banned explosions that caused radioactive debris to be present outside the territorial limits of the state under whose jurisdiction or control such explosion was conducted. Each of the signatories, the Treaty said, undertook to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any other way participating in the carrying out of any nuclear weapons test explosions in the atmosphere, outer space and under water.

The Treaty is of unlimited duration and open to accession for all states at any time. It entered into force on October 10, 1963.

For the first time in the many years overcast by the cold war, states of different socio-economic systems succeeded in agreeing on an important issue affecting the vital interests of all mankind. The Treaty was designed to end the contamination of man's environment with radioactive fall-out, which endangered man's health and did untold damage to the animal and plant world.

The Moscow Treaty was welcomed all over the world. The vast majority of countries signed the document within the first few weeks.

Soviet Proposals at the 18th UN General Assembly

Making the most of the favourable situation, the Soviet Union came to the 18th UN General Assembly with an exhaustive programme of measures designed to combat the arms race and to ease international tension. Most prominent among these were proposals on expediting the disarmament talks and securing an effective solution of this most cardinal of all problems.

Meeting the Western powers half-way, the Soviet Government consented to a limited number of intercontinental, anti-rocket and ground-to-air rockets to be left in the possession of the USSR and USA in their own territory not only until the end of the second, but also of the third stage, that is, until the completion of the entire process of general and complete disarmament.

Seeking to prevent the spread of the arms race to outer space and to afford the best possible conditions for the further exploration and use of outer space, the Soviet Government proposed to the United States to negotiate a ban on the placing in orbit of any objects carrying nuclear weapons.

The Soviet programme again called attention to the beneficial effects to be derived from a German peace settlement and a normalisation in West Berlin. It urged a non-aggression pact between Warsaw Treaty countries and NATO, measures to prevent sudden attack, reduction of foreign troops in the FRG and the GDR, reduction of military budgets, and institution of denuclearised zones in various regions of the globe. The Soviet Government also underscored the immense importance of abolishing the remaining colonial regimes.

The Soviet programme, which won far-flung world-wide acclaim, was described everywhere as a programme of realistic opportunities.

One of the Soviet proposals was duly passed and approved in an appropriate resolution of the General Assembly, dated October 17, 1963, formalising the Soviet-American understanding "to refrain from placing in orbit around the earth any objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction". The resolution also called on all states to refrain from orbiting objects carrying nuclear weapons and from encouraging such acts.

Soviet Proposal on the Peaceful Accommodation of Territorial Disputes

Acting on the interests of enduring peace, the Soviet Government proposed on the eve of 1964 to conclude an international agreement in which the states would reject

the use of force in settling territorial disputes and border issues. History shows that dangerous friction between states arises most often over border questions. Many of the young states inherited from colonial regimes a large number of deliberately confused border problems. Something like a hundred regions exist in the world today, whose possession is contested by various states. The Soviet Government stressed in its proposal that most of the territorial disputes tend to strain relations between the parties concerned and are liable to touch off serious armed conflicts, thus constituting a potential danger to world peace.

The urgency of the new Soviet proposal was borne out by the fact that territorial disputes also exist in Europe, where two world wars were largely triggered over border issues, as well as in Asia, where border conflicts are still exercising a pernicious influence on the life of nations, causing armed forces to grow and resources to be spent unproductively. The border problem in Africa, too, being an aftermath of colonialism, is highly confusing, and some Latin American countries have not yet recovered from armed conflicts that had flared up in the past over territorial disputes.

Today, nothing can justify the use of armed force in settling border disputes. The Soviet Government stated emphatically that the matter of eliminating the use of force in territorial disputes would be effectively tackled at the present time. The Soviet message set out the main constructive points of an international agreement (or treaty) banning force in settling border issues. These envisage:

a solemn undertaking by the states party to the agreement to refrain from the use of force in altering existing state borders;

recognition of the fact that the territory of a state must not, even temporarily, be the object of an invasion, attack, military occupation or any other coercive act taken directly or indirectly by another state for political, economic, strategic, frontier or any other reasons;

a firm declaration that disparities in the social or political system, refusal to recognise a state, the absence of diplomatic relations, or any other pretext, did not provide

a valid reason for one state to violate the territorial immunity of another;

an undertaking to settle all territorial disputes exclusively by peaceful means, such as negotiations, mediation, consentient procedures and all other pacific means selected by the parties concerned in accordance with the UN Charter.

The Soviet Government held that an agreement whereby states ruled out the use of force in settling territorial disputes would considerably relieve the world situation and pave the way to greater international confidence.

**Soviet-GDR Treaty of Friendship,
Mutual Assistance and Co-operation,
June 12, 1964**

The signing in Moscow of the Soviet-GDR Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Co-operation on June 12, 1964, had a strong bearing on the further efforts of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries against West German militarism, for greater European security.

The treaty, concluded for a term of 20 years, consists of a preamble and eleven articles.

The preamble notes that both signatories are moved by a desire to continue developing their fraternal friendship, which accords with the basic interests of the peoples of the USSR and GDR and the whole socialist community. It speaks of their determination to work jointly and effectively against the threat to international security and peace emanating from the revenge-seeking and militaristic forces. Both sides declared their wish to promote a German peace treaty and the country's reunification on a pacific and democratic basis.

Article 1 defines the nature of the relations prevailing between the two socialist states. It reads: "The High Contracting Parties, basing themselves on complete equality, mutual respect of state sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs and the lofty principles of socialist internationalism, acting on the principles of mutual advantage and mutual fraternal assistance, shall continue to develop

and strengthen in all spheres their relations of friendship and close co-operation."

Articles 2 and 3 deal with the joint Soviet-GDR efforts in behalf of European peace and security, and the solution of the cardinal international problems. Article 4 states specifically that the immunity of the borders of the German Democratic Republic is the basic factor of European security. Article 5 sets out the commitments of either side in the event of an armed attack on the other.

"The High Contracting Parties," says Article 6, "shall regard West Berlin as an independent political entity."

Article 7 deals with the creation of a peaceful, democratic and united German state, practicable only by equal negotiation and agreement between the two sovereign German states.

Article 8 envisages that the signatories will develop and strengthen in every way their economic, scientific and technical relations, that they will co-ordinate their economic plans in conformance with the principles of the international socialist division of labour and promote specialisation and co-operation in production.

The Treaty is a big contribution to the struggle waged by the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic and all peace-loving forces against West German militarism and revanchism, for European security. It is an effective barrier to the territorial claims of the Bonn militarists. It guarantees the immunity of the GDR and thereby creates favourable political conditions for the full-scale building of socialism in that country. Walter Ulbricht noted rightly that it has an immense international impact. It broadens and solidifies the fraternal friendship and co-operation of the Soviet Union and the GDR and, at once, guarantees the immunity of the frontiers of the German Democratic Republic, this being one of the basic factors of European security.

The Soviet-GDR Treaty will play an important part in combating the aggressive plans nurtured by the West German militarists, who are eager to lay their hands on nuclear weapons in order to "absorb" the GDR and repattern the territorial map of Europe.

In the last few years, the GDR has made some new proposals and taken concrete steps to improve relations with

the FRG and thus further European security. It will be recalled that in 1961 the Government of the GDR took important measures to reinforce its frontiers. In March 1962, it backed the UN resolution on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and called on the West German Government to follow suit.

The GDR Government opposes the idea of giving the West German revenge-seekers access to nuclear weapons. It exposed the monstrous plan of the Bonn militarists to set up a nuclear "mine belt" along the FRG borders with the GDR and Czechoslovakia.

On May 5, 1965, the People's Chamber of the GDR issued a manifesto to the German people and the peoples and governments of the world, saying: "The German Democratic Republic will do its utmost to prevent a war from ever starting on German territory; it will do its utmost to promote peace and security in Europe, so that peace should reign on earth and the German nation should be reunified as a peace-abiding, democratic state."

The German Democratic Republic is contributing eminently to the struggle of the European peoples against German militarism. It is the mainstay of the progressive forces of the German nation, and an important factor of European peace.

NATO Nuclear Force Is a Threat to World Peace

The imperialist plans of forming a NATO nuclear force present a grave threat to the security of nations. Nurtured by the West since 1959, these plans pursue a very definite purpose.

The ruling element in the United States is projecting the multilateral NATO nuclear force to bolster imperialism's positions in its struggle against the socialist countries, the revolutionary and liberation movements. One of the main objectives of the scheme is to give access to nuclear weapons to the Federal Republic of Germany, which is clamouring candidly for a revision of Europe's post-war frontiers. Making the most of the Paris Agreements, the FRG has built up a modern 500,000-strong army. It is technically and economically capable, too, of producing

its own nuclear weapons and means of nuclear delivery. This is why the idea of giving the FRG access to nuclear weapons is creating legitimate public alarm.

The multilateral NATO nuclear force scheme indicates that imperialist reaction has grown more active, although it shows at the same time that the contradictions in the imperialist camp in general, and NATO in particular, have grown more acute.

If the American plan is put into practice, it will ring in a new round in the arms race and impel a growth of armaments and armed forces in Europe. The US Defence Secretary said that the US stockpile of nuclear weapons in Europe had increased by 60 per cent in 1964 and was still growing. The aggregate numerical strength of the armed forces of the NATO countries has climbed to nearly 6,000,000. This has brought about a drastic deterioration in the international situation. It has subverted peaceful coexistence and mutually advantageous co-operation between countries with different social systems, and has added alarmingly to the threat of a thermonuclear war.

The communique of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Treaty countries in January 1965 stressed: "A special role is being assigned in the aggressive imperialist policy to the plans of creating a multilateral NATO nuclear force. The Warsaw Treaty countries hold that the plans of founding a multilateral NATO nuclear force advocated by the ruling circles of the United States and West Germany, constitute a grave threat to European and world peace."¹

In its notes to the governments of the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany on January 18, 1965, the Soviet Union called attention to the dangerous nature of their projected measures, which are being taken in gross defiance of the Potsdam Agreements and of other important international instruments.

The Soviet Union has put forward the following constructive proposals: to create an effective system of collective security in Europe, reach a German peace settlement and normalise the situation in West Berlin, conclude

¹ *Pravda*, Jan. 22, 1965.

a non-aggression pact between the NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries, freeze nuclear arms in Central Europe and establish a denuclearised zone there, etc. These proposals are the only sensible and sound alternative to the imperialist policy of splitting Europe and building up an aggressive NATO nuclear force involving the West German revenge-seekers.

A place of special prominence is held among the above proposals by the offer of a German peace settlement and the normalisation of the situation in West Berlin. This is a pressing and vital issue. The countries that are sincerely eager to improve the international climate and ring down the curtain on the cold war must give a hand in solving the problem of a German settlement. The survivals of the Second World War in Europe have got to be extirpated. This is absolutely essential.

Do Not Let Up in the Struggle for Peace and International Security

The versatile political efforts of the Soviet Union are based on a scientific and principled approach to all the problems of international life. One of the main objectives of Soviet foreign policy is to promote general and complete disarmament. While working for general and complete disarmament, the USSR also promotes all measures likely to curtail the arms race and enhance international confidence. By this token, the Soviet Government submitted to the 18-Nation Disarmament Committee (in January 1964) and the 19th UN General Assembly, which opened on December 1, 1964, concrete proposals designed to relieve international tension. Among other things, these proposals were lined up with the suggestions and ideas of other states aired at various talks and conferences. The USSR laid a special accent on the matter of reducing further the military budgets of the big states by 10-15 per cent or to any other agreed extent. The Soviet Union suggested that part of the resources thus released be used to assist the developing countries, which face the arduous challenge of consolidating their national economies. In an effort to relieve tensions, the Soviet Union came forward

with the initiative of cutting its military expenditures under the 1965 budget by 500,000,000 rubles. Soviet diplomats have carried the fight for disarmament to the 18-Nation Committee, which resumed its work in Geneva on July 27, 1965.

The other proposals contained in various recent Soviet documents would also be sure to improve the world climate. Prominent among them is the proposal to withdraw or reduce troops stationed in foreign territories, to dismantle foreign military bases, establish denuclearised zones, prohibit the use of nuclear weapons, and the like. The Soviet Union attached particular importance to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Government of the USSR noted time and again that, lacking a general and complete disarmament agreement, the proliferation of nuclear weapons is bound to generate fresh international tensions and add to the threat of a nuclear war. The greatest danger in this context is presented by the scheme of a multilateral NATO nuclear force. In its notes to the governments of the Western powers, in TASS statements and other documents, the USSR has strongly condemned the idea of creating a multilateral NATO nuclear force.

The Soviet Government considers the problem of European security one of the most urgent, since it was Europe where the world wars broke out and Europe, too, that suffered most from their consequences. To ensure European security is, first and foremost, to scrap all revenge-seeking doctrines and acknowledge the status quo. The USSR has often articulated its readiness to negotiate an effective, all-embracing system of collective security, which would replace the existing confrontation in Europe of opposite military alignments. As a first step, it has offered to conclude a non-aggression pact between the NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries.

The establishment of denuclearised zones, especially in such regions where large stockpiles of nuclear weapons are concentrated at present and the danger of an armed conflict is therefore greater, would go a long way in eliminating the threat of a nuclear war and in restricting the arms race. The Soviet Government welcomed the Polish proposal of creating an atom-free zone in Central Europe and the fresh Polish offer of freezing nuclear weapons in that

area. The USSR also welcomed denuclearisation proposals for Northern Europe, the Balkans, Africa, the Indian Ocean, the Middle East and other parts of the world. The Soviet Government has suggested that undertakings to maintain atom-free zones could be assumed not only by groups of states embracing whole continents or large geographic areas, but also by more restricted groups or even individual countries. The USSR has announced it would hail any state which decides to bar foreign powers from stationing nuclear weapons in its territory, its ports or airfields.

Eager to stimulate the disarmament negotiations, the Soviet Government has backed the proposal of the Cairo conference of non-aligned countries (October 1964) to call a World Disarmament Conference to which all states would be invited. The USSR also welcomed the proposal of the People's Republic of China to call a Summit Conference to discuss the complete banning and destruction of nuclear weapons, in which the states would make the first step by rejecting the use of such weapons.

In suggesting the various measures restricting the arms race, the Soviet Government took it for granted that agreement would be reached about the appropriate mutually acceptable forms of controlling these measures.

The Soviet Union is a consistent champion of the policy of coexistence for states with different social systems.

The relations prevailing between the Soviet Union and Finland are convincing evidence that the coexistence policy is viable and fruitful. Soviet-Finnish co-operation is based on complete equality, non-interference in each other's affairs and consideration for each other's interests. It is developing well in the fields of science and culture, as well as trade and economy. The good progress of Soviet-Finnish good-neighbour relations has, among other things, prompted the Soviet Government to lease part of the Saimaa Canal to Finland as of 1962 on terms that do not yield any sort of material advantage to the USSR. Such friendly relations accord with the basic interests of the Soviet and Finnish peoples. Soviet co-operation with the lesser countries of Western Europe is also expanding. In June 1965, the Prime Minister of Norway, Einar H. Gerhardsen, and the Prime Minister of Sweden, Tage Erlan-

der, visited the USSR. A six-year Soviet-Swedish trade agreement was concluded in early 1965 and a Soviet-Austrian agreement for 1966-67 was concluded in July.

Soviet Efforts to Consolidate the UN as a Peace Instrument

The Soviet Union is doing its utmost to promote the role and prestige of the United Nations Organisation. The mounting strength of socialism, the victory of the national liberation revolutions and the emergence in the world of dozens of new independent states have altered the distribution of strength and the orientation of UN political activity. This is borne out by the various decisions passed under the influence of the socialist and neutralist states concerning the abolition of colonialism, the banning of nuclear weapons tests, the proclamation of a denuclearised zone in Africa, the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, and equitable international economic co-operation.

Unwilling to reconcile itself to this consolidation of the peace-loving states in the UN, the United States attempted to demolish that organisation from within. It took advantage of the question of payment for the cost of the UN operations in the Congo and the Middle East. More than \$400 million was spent on the maintenance of UN troops in the Congo and another \$135 million on the "international police force" stationed on the Israeli-Egyptian border after the Anglo-French-Israeli aggression against Egypt in 1956.

As far back as 1950, the United States, which then controlled a mechanical majority in the United Nations, saddled the General Assembly with a resolution speciously entitled, "Uniting for Peace", which defied the UN Charter and gave the Assembly powers concerning the maintenance of peace, which rightfully belong to the Security Council. On the strength of this resolution, the United States dragged through a General Assembly decision in 1963 that the UN operations in the Congo and the maintenance of the "international police force" ought to be paid for by all members of the organisation, although the UN Charter, the

accepted rules of international law and the laws of justice require that the financial responsibility for the aggression against Egypt and the Congo, for the despatch there of UN troops, should be borne by those who committed the aggression, that is, the United States and its NATO allies.

The Soviet Union refused to cover the expenses incurred by the aggressive conduct of the imperialist powers against peoples fighting for their freedom and independence.

Shortly before the 19th UN General Assembly opened, the United States launched a vociferous campaign, urging to invoke Article 19 of the UN Charter against countries that refuse to pay UN expenses. Yet Article 19 says that a member which is in arrears in the payments of its financial contribution to the regular UN budget for two full years shall have no vote in the General Assembly. It has no relation whatsoever, as we see, to the reimbursement of material losses incurred by the aggressive actions of the imperialists.

Due to the attitude of the United States, which sought either to retain the blue UN flag as a cover for its black deeds or to break up the UN, the General Assembly confined itself that year to only a general discussion. No decisions were taken on current and pressing international problems.

The general discussion revealed, however, that most of the countries gravitate towards peace and that they oppose the arms race and favour the final abolition of colonial regimes. Many of the delegations condemned the armed ventures of the imperialists in the Congo and Vietnam. They urged the establishment of a standing UN body for the promotion of world trade and strove to focus the session on settling various justifiably disturbing problems.

The imperialist powers refused to discuss any political problems. They urged the General Assembly to take sanctions against the Soviet Union and other countries opposing the intrigues of the enemies of peace and world security. But despite all its threats, the efforts of the United States foundered on the firm determination of the socialist and neutralist states to consolidate the UN as an instrument of peace. The memory of the collapse of the League of Nations, which became a sinister sign of the imminence of a world war, still lingered.

In the circumstances, the USSR and other states attempted to take the United Nations out of the impasse created by the USA and its NATO partners. The Soviet Union agreed to accept the plan suggested by the Afro-Asian countries, under which UN members consent without prejudice to their fundamental attitude to put aside their differences over the financing of UN operations; the question of invoking Article 19 must not be raised, and the existing financial difficulties are to be eliminated by voluntary contributions. The Soviet delegation announced that once the Assembly begins to work normally on the strength of the Afro-Asian plan, the USSR would decide the size of its voluntary contribution. In August 1965, US diplomats accepted this proposal, being compelled to reckon with the opinion of the vast majority of UN members. The *New York Herald Tribune* noted sadly that for the first time since the United Nations was established at the end of World War II the United States faces an unpleasant, revolutionary change. It has lost the leadership of the world organisation. Worse still, said the paper, the majority which it once controlled has turned against it.

USSR Stands in the Van of the Struggle Against Imperialism

In the past years the balance of forces in the world has been tilting inexorably in favour of the fighters against imperialism and its threat to peace and the freedom of nations. This trend in international affairs has dismayed the imperialists. They are resorting to various new methods of combating the revolutionary forces, and are mounting counter-attacks here and there. Recent events show that the more aggressive forces have become dangerously active. In the leading Western countries exponents of the bankrupt policy "from positions of strength" are gaining influence. The more bellicose imperialists are defying the peoples and trying to turn back the clock of history. US imperialism is distinctly a bulwark of reaction, a world gendarme.

To repulse the US policy of aggression is the main and most urgent task in the struggle for peace. This is why the

USSR is bent on uniting the efforts of the socialist countries and the revolutionary forces against the US imperialists.

On May 9, 1965, the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Soviet Government called on the governments, parliaments and peoples of all countries to champion peace, close their ranks and enlist in the peace struggle all those who have not yet realised the danger of a thermonuclear war. "Acting on the ideas of the great Lenin," the appeal said, "the Soviet Union has always championed peace and always worked perseveringly for the prevention of a world war. Let no one doubt the peaceful aspirations of our country. But let no one doubt either our determination to repulse the forces of aggression!"

* * *

World developments fully confirm the realism of the conclusions and propositions of the 20th-22nd congresses and the Programme of the CPSU, and of the general line of the world communist movement enunciated at the conferences of fraternal parties in 1957 and 1960.

The emergence of the world socialist system, the successes of the international working-class and national liberation movements, the striking scientific and technical discoveries that repatterned from top to bottom the means of warfare, and the increasing influence which socialism and the social forces championing peace are exercising on the world—all this has altered the course of international relations. Never before have relations between states consisted of so complex a mixture of political, economic, ideological, diplomatic and military contacts. Never before in the history of man has the destiny of the world depended so much and so crucially on the solution of the key international problems. It has grown more than obvious that solving these problems by military means, as the imperialists did in the past, is fraught with dire consequences to mankind. An armed conflict of any sort is likely to develop in the present conditions into a universal nuclear disaster. Despite the numerous international crises provoked lately by the imperialists, mankind has succeeded in avoiding a

new world war, chiefly due to the efforts of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

As they make and carry through the foreign policy of the Soviet state, the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Government of the USSR take note of the radical changes in the balance of world strength, of the immense economic, political and military potential of the Soviet Union. They are guided by their Marxist-Leninist analysis of the key objective factors governing international relations. Soviet foreign policy leans heavily above all on such powerful revolutionary factors as the world working-class and national liberation movements. The foreign policy of the USSR is averse to any voluntaristic and unrealistic approach to the developments and events of international life, for this is likely to induce overconfidence or weakness in the face of the imperialist threat.

The Soviet Union is showing models of Leninist foreign relations, highlighted by the combination of revolutionary firmness in upholding the key principles of socialism and in settling the principal issues of world politics affecting the destiny of the peoples, with due flexibility in tactics, with a readiness to negotiate, to reach agreements, to make mutual concessions in the interests of peace, freedom and the independence of nations. At the same time, the Soviet Government shows constant concern for the defences of the USSR, especially in improving the nuclear-rocket shield, which dependably protects the countries of the socialist community.

The development of the Soviet economic potential, the mounting political prestige of the USSR and its greatly enhanced defensive potential, which serve peace and socialism, have gone a long way in frustrating the imperialist policy of "rolling back" communism.

Soviet diplomatic actions are prompted by the need to repulse aggressors and, at once, extinguish the sparks of armed conflict in the teeth of imperialist provocations.

Recent international events show that the peoples have gained their greatest successes in the fight for political independence and the extirpation of colonialism precisely in the environment created by the immensely increased might of the USSR and the other socialist countries.

Soviet foreign policy proves that by its consistent struggle for peace the Soviet people are not only fulfilling their historic mission of averting a nuclear war, but that they are also *creating the most favourable conditions for the successful building of socialism and communism.*

The basic external actions of the Soviet Union, and its concrete activities in the world arena are imbued with the spirit of proletarian internationalism. *Ceaseless concern for strengthening and developing the world socialist system, the unity and cohesion of the socialist countries, of their friendship and fraternity,* is the key trend of Soviet foreign policy. The socio-economic and political rapport of the fraternal countries is the objective foundation on which lasting and friendly relations can and must develop between all the states of the socialist system.

The other important trend in Soviet foreign policy is *all-out support of the national liberation movement and development of solidarity and co-operation with the independent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.*

The colonial system of imperialism has been disintegrating rapidly in recent years, while the new states, embarked on independent development, have gained added strength. Imperialism has failed to hold down this process for all its desperate efforts, not short of wars and armed interventions. The establishment by Asian, African and Latin American countries of co-operation with the USSR and other socialist states, their joint actions for peace and national independence, their struggle against colonialism, and their refusal to enter imperialist blocs, has cumulatively restricted the sphere of operation of the aggressive imperialist policy, which has grown more narrow after the emergence of the world socialist system.

Promotion of the principles of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and the deliverance of mankind from the threat of a world war is another highly important objective of Soviet foreign policy. Peaceful coexistence, now the only alternative to nuclear war, is the Leninist foundation in foreign policy which the Soviet Union has been promoting ceaselessly in its relations with the capitalist states. The Soviet Union holds that these principles should apply to all states with different social systems, whether big or small.

The consolidation of the peace-loving forces is an important tendency in contemporary international relations. Yet the monopoly groups in the imperialist countries, especially the United States, are going out of their way to exacerbate international relations. The armed intervention in Vietnam, the Congo and the Dominican Republic, the stepped up arms race, the efforts to remilitarise West Germany by various means, including the multilateral NATO nuclear force scheme, the cold war escalation and the extension of existing and establishment of new politico-military alignments—all this is an upshot of the aggressive imperialist policy. Powerful forces are opposed to this policy. The current international situation sets the peace-loving and revolutionary forces the insistent task of preventing a world nuclear war, thwarting local wars started by the imperialists and rendering all-out support to the liberation struggles of the peoples.

The Soviet Union has always stood in the van of the struggle against imperialism. It stands in the van of this struggle today. Its military and economic potential, and its political prestige as well, are thrown on the scales in favour of the peoples fighting against imperialism, for freedom and social progress, for peace.