

The Soviet White Paper on The North Atlantic Pact

Translation of the full text of the Statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR published in the Moscow *Izvestia*, January 29, 1949.

ISBN: 978-1-387-96383-6

SOVIET RUSSIA TODAY
NEW YORK 1949

THE NOVEMBER 8TH PUBLISHING HOUSE
TORONTO 2022

For the past half-year the U.S. State Department has been negotiating a military alliance known as the North Atlantic Pact with Canada and the Western Union countries, England, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxemburg. Even before the final terms of the pact are settled, efforts are being made to draw in other countries, for example the Scandinavian countries, including Norway, which has a common border with the Soviet Union. This is comparable to the Soviet Union seeking a military pact with Mexico.

The pact is officially called a "security" rather than a military pact. But the peoples of Europe whose experiences in World War II taught them that the greatest threat to peace would come from a revival of fascism, are expressing grave doubts that the interests of peace can be served by a pact based on rebuilding the Ruhr arsenal, embracing a re-milita-

alized Western Germany, and directed against our wartime ally, the Soviet Union.

While our statesmen insist that the pact is in line with United Nations Charter provisions for regional security arrangements, it is an odd sort of "region" which spans the Atlantic ocean to take in countries of two hemispheres, and encompasses Italy on the Mediterranean as well. Nor does the pact conform to Charter provisions which vest in the Security Council the right to determine whether peace is threatened and make any such arrangement subject to its jurisdiction. The pact can only undermine the UN.

Furthermore, in committing the United States to give military aid if any of these nations are attacked, the pact is unconstitutional, since only Congress has the right to declare war. Efforts now being made to bring the pact into technical conformity with our Constitution will not affect its essential war-like nature.

We are publishing the full text of the statement on the pact issued by the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs because we believe that it is of the utmost importance that Americans should understand how the Soviet Union regards this effort to organize Western Europe into an anti-Soviet alliance.

It is inevitable that the Soviet leaders should re-

gard this as a war-like, aggressive measure, and should express themselves frankly on the dangers they see in it. Their analysis of the pact and its purposes is shared by peace-loving people in our country and throughout the world.

What is the Soviet Union's answer to this move?

The Soviet answer is Stalin's proposal to meet with President Truman to compose the differences between the two countries, and to reach an agreement not to go to war.

The Soviet leaders are countering these war-like moves with new efforts to keep the peace. Since the whole motivation of the pact is the presumed danger of aggression from the Soviet Union, these Soviet peace efforts remove all possible justification for the pact.

Let the American people repudiate the plans for a military alliance against our wartime ally, the Soviet Union, and insist that the North Atlantic Pact be set aside and that President Truman accept Premier Stalin's offer to talk peace. — The Editors, Soviet Russia Today

Text of the Soviet Statement

On January 14, the State Department of the United States of America published a lengthy

statement under the sonorous title "Building the Peace. Collective Security in the North Atlantic Area."

That official document presents an outline of the United States' position in regard to the so-called "North Atlantic Pact," negotiations about which the Government of the United States of America has since last summer been conducting, together with Canada, with the Governments of Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxemburg.

While last year the ruling circles of the five above-mentioned West European powers had on the pretext of collective defence, under the patronage of the United States, created a military-political alliance, this year the far-reaching Anglo-American plan for establishing a "North Atlantic Alliance" is being carried out with the participation of the same European countries and Canada, directly headed by the United States of America. In his statement of January 20, President Truman declared that the draft of the Treaty of North Atlantic security, whose officially proclaimed purpose is a desire to strengthen security in the North Atlantic area, would soon be submitted to the Senate for consideration.

I. The Western Union — a Weapon of the Aggressive Anglo-American Bloc in Europe

In March 1948, a treaty of mutual assistance and collective defence was concluded in Brussels between Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxemburg, which laid the foundation for a separate group of certain West European states, known as the "Western Union."

It was envisaged that certain other European countries, willing to adjust their policy to the aims of the above group headed by Great Britain, would be included in the Western Union. It is likewise known that the founders of the Western Union had from the very beginning precluded the possibility of participation in that alliance of the people's democracies and of the Soviet Union, and have thus disclosed that the Western Union was not formed with the view of uniting the peace-loving European countries and not in the interest of assuring durable peace in Europe generally, but with other ends in view, which have nothing in common with the concern for strengthening peace and international security.

It is not fortuitous that statesmen of the

member countries of that group, beginning with the British Minister Bevin, were obliged to declare openly that the establishment of the Western Union signifies an important change in the policy of these countries. This could no longer be concealed with backstage preparations for that group being completed. It is easy to see that the establishment of the above alliance means that the governments of Great Britain, France and the other participant countries have finally abandoned the policy that was pursued by the democratic states, which were members of the anti-Hitler coalition during the Second World War and which set as their aim the consolidation of the forces of all the peace-loving states in order to do away with Hitler aggression and fascism and to prevent the resurgence of aggressive forces after the termination of the war. The establishment of the Western Union signifies, in the first place, a complete change in the policy of Great Britain and France in regard to the German problem and demonstrates a renunciation by the governments of those countries of the democratic and anti-aggressive policy in regard to Germany which was adopted by the Yalta and Potsdam conferences of the anti-Hitler coalition powers.

During the Second World War the allies in the anti-Hitler coalition were united not only by the will to end victoriously the war of liberation against Hitler Germany and fascism. They were also united by the will to prevent in the future as well the German aggression that has unleashed two world wars within the past decades. These noble aspirations found their expression in the decisions of the Yalta and Potsdam conferences. The treaties of friendship and mutual assistance, concluded by the Soviet Union with Britain in 1942, and with France in 1944, for terms of twenty years, express the same policy aimed at preventing the resurgence of an aggressive Germany. It is perfectly clear that the policy which found its expression in these and other similar treaties conformed both to the interests of the signatories and to the interests of all the peace-loving nations of Europe.

The Soviet Union now as before abides by this policy, which fully conforms to the decisions of the Yalta and Potsdam conferences of the heads of the Governments of the USSR, the United States and Great Britain and of France which endorsed these decisions, a policy directed towards ensuring durable peace in Europe and preventing

fresh aggression on the part of the state which had been the chief culprit in unleashing two world wars.

The formation of the Western Union means that Great Britain and France have renounced the above anti-aggressive policy, adopted at the Yalta and Potsdam conferences, and that these powers have embarked upon a new policy, extremely dangerous for the peace-loving nations, with the purpose of establishing their domination over the other nations of Europe, not stopping at employing for these ends yesterday's aggressor, which has since the termination of the war become dependent on them. Nothing else could explain why, though the Brussels pact mentions in passing the desire to prevent the resurgence of an aggressive policy on Germany's part, the Governments of Great Britain and France at the present time strive together with the Government of the United States to enlist and utilize for their ends Western Germany, where the old pro-Nazi and militaristic elements of German reaction are ever more deeply entrenching themselves in all sections of the administrative machinery, with the help of the Anglo-American occupation authorities in the first place. The fact that this turn in the

policy of the West-European states has met with support and encouragement from the ruling circles of the United States considerably aggravates the danger of the political developments that have taken place in the above European countries which have abandoned the policy of peace and taken the path of preparing fresh aggression in Europe.

As distinct from all the treaties of mutual assistance concluded by the Soviet Union with other European states, Britain and France among them, and aimed at preventing the possibility of fresh aggression on Germany's part, and thereby promoting peace in Europe, the military alliance of the five Western states has been set up not so much in regard to Germany as with the view to employing the group of Western powers they have formed against the states which were their allies in the Second World War. Aggressive statements are frankly made by a number of statesmen of the Western countries as well as in the Anglo-American and French press to the effect that the Western Union has been established against the USSR and the people's democracies, notwithstanding the fact that the peaceful policies of these countries are indisputable and a universally

known fact. It is indisputable then that no matter how hard they try to conceal the true aims of the Brussels treaty, the establishment of the Western Union has nothing in common with concern for the self-defence of these states.

Furthermore it has by now been made sufficiently clear that acting on the pretext of preventing a situation that would endanger the so-called “economic stability” of the signatories of that pact, they are preparing to employ military measures and every kind of repression against the working class and the growing democratic forces within those states, as well as against the mounting movement of liberation of the peoples in the colonies and dependent countries. It is not accidental that the Brussels pact represents an alliance of colonial powers, which for the sake of preserving their age-long privileges in the colonies want to employ the presently initiated military political grouping in order to suppress the national liberation movement in these colonies. All this lays particular emphasis on the anti-democratic and reactionary aggressive nature of the Western Union.

The alliance of the five West-European states represents a military-political supplement to the economic association of the European countries

that has been set up to carry through the “Marshall Plan” in Europe. Both these groupings of European countries are steered by the ruling circles of the Anglo-American bloc, which is by no means concerned with the attainment of the national-state or even the economic goals of all the countries participating in the above groupings — a bloc whose purpose is to bolster up and further expand its own strategic military and economic positions.

And just as the Marshall Plan is not aimed at the genuine economic revival of the European states, but serves as a means of adjusting the policy and economy of the “Marshallized” countries to the narrow self-seeking and strategic military plans for Anglo-American domination of Europe, so has the new group been formed not with the aim of mutual assistance and collective defence of the countries participating in the Western Union — because were the Yalta and Potsdam agreements observed, these countries would be threatened by no aggression whatever — but with the aim of bolstering up and further expanding the dominating influence of the Anglo-American ruling circles in Europe and of subjugating to their narrow interests the entire foreign and domestic

policies of the respective European states. The incompatibility of such political plans of the Anglo-American bloc with the concern for peace and with the realization of the principles of democracy in the European countries is perfectly clear.

Hardly had the Western Union come into being last March than the ruling circles of the United States promptly declared that this Union would be given every support.

Such a statement was perfectly natural, for those circles have every reason to believe that the new grouping can have no escape from them and will be entirely dependent on Anglo-American plans of every sort. But to meet all contingencies, special American observers, whose role is quite understandable, were introduced into the Western Union. Now it is clear to all that the faster and farther the countries of the Western Union progress along the path of opposing the people's democracies and the Soviet Union — a course onto which they are being persistently pushed by the policy of the Anglo-American bloc — the more will the West-European powers become politically and economically dependent on the ruling circles of the United States who are not in the least bit concerned about the political independ-

ence and economic revival of the European states.

The inevitable result of this will be — as is already observed at every step — a sharpening of the contradictions both between the United States and the countries of the Western bloc and amongst the West-European grouping itself. It is not on a sound nor on a firm basis of economic revival that the new West-European grouping has been set up, a grouping which is of an auxiliary significance in a way, if one bears in mind the broader European grouping set up from among the “Marshallized” countries. Far from rendering the countries participating in the new grouping any substantial practical aid, the aforementioned group in no way prevented the appearance of mounting economic difficulties in many West-European states, nor did it prevent the tremendous growth of unemployment in some of them, and it did not help in opening hopeful prospects for their further economic progress. The aggressive purposes of this grouping are further reflected in ever-increasing demands for greater armies and military expenditures, and this increasingly undermines their chances for a further and stable economic advance. At the same time such a situation leads to an intensification of grave political

difficulties inside these states. And this at a time when the Soviet Union and the people's democracies, which are taking but the first steps in their socialist development, are moving along the road of steady and rapid economic rehabilitation and advance, along the road of consolidating the democratic foundations and political unity of the nations that have emancipated themselves from reactionary, oppressive regimes.

The Western Union has launched quite a number of measures by now for assuming its structural shape. As far back as last spring, following the formation of a Consultative Council, a standing organ of that Union comprising the representatives of the five states was set up in London. They have likewise set up a military committee and even a Western Union Commanders-in-Chief Committee comprising the chiefs of staffs of the five states with British Field Marshal Montgomery at the head, although the founders of the Western Union cannot prove that there exists any danger of aggression for their states.

The haste displayed in carrying through all these organizational measures, including the institution of a Commanders-in-Chief Committee, under conditions of the present peaceful situation

in no way attests to the desire of the participants in the new grouping to ensure durable peace in Europe. The fussy manner of carrying through all these measures rather shows that they pursue the aim of bringing political pressure to bear on certain European countries, the Western part of Germany among them, and with the help of this publicity hullabaloo around all these measures, to speed up the enlistment of these countries into the western grouping and at the same time to foment a sense of alarm, uncertainty and war hysteria in public circles of the European states, this being at the present time one of the chief tactical methods of promoting the Anglo-American bloc's aggressive policy in Europe.

Apart from setting up this new grouping in Europe, the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain have in the past months been engaged in setting up a North Atlantic Alliance comprising the same five West European states, Canada and the United States of America. The aims of the North Atlantic Alliance are much more far flung than those of the West European grouping and it is quite easy to see that these aims are very closely interwoven with the plans for the violent establishment of Anglo-American world

supremacy under the aegis of the United States of America.

II. The North Atlantic Pact and Anglo-American Plans for World Domination

If the institution of the Western Union conforms to the aims of the Anglo-American bloc in Europe, it is now already evident that the West-European grouping is but one, and not the main one, in the plans for establishing Anglo-American world domination. While leaving Great Britain chief place in the Western Union, the leading circles of the United States have every possibility of influencing the way they want the policy of the entire West-European grouping.

Nor should it be forgotten that the treaty signed in Rio de Janeiro by the countries of North and South America, which assures the influence of the ruling circles of the United States in regard to the overwhelming majority of these states, entered into force at the end of last year.

The realization of the Western Union in Europe and entering into force of the Inter-American Pact is regarded by the State Department in the above-mentioned document as an important

prerequisite for promoting the policy of the United States on a world-wide scale. And the North Atlantic Pact is advanced as the chief instrument of this policy, with the groupings of countries already created in Europe and in America to become the props of that pact; from the very outset the ruling circles of the United States have taken over control of this entire business.

In its document entitled "Collective Security in the North Atlantic Area" the State Department of the United States attempts to present the North Atlantic Pact which it has prepared as a regional agreement on matters of security among the countries of the North Atlantic, thereby veiling the true nature and idea of that pact. Everybody knows that the countries of the Northern Atlantic are not threatened by any aggression and this alone shows the inconsistency of the above-cited explanation of the need for such a pact.

In the endeavour to mask more thoroughly the true nature and purpose of the North Atlantic Pact, the State Department was obliged to resort to ridiculous inventions about the Soviet Union's "obstructionist policy" in the United Nations and to deliberately nebulous statements about the need "to meet the potential aggressor with over-

whelming force,” this allegedly being the duty of the special grouping of countries, with the United States at the head, which cannot wait until the United Nations organization becomes sufficiently strengthened.

The State Department was unable to conceal the hostile nature of the North Atlantic Pact in regard to the Soviet Union and the people’s democracies, and resorted to all sorts of murky hints about a “potential aggressor.” On the other hand, the State Department did not venture to proclaim openly the anti-Soviet aims of the new treaty which it had prepared, because the dissemination of slander about the aggressiveness of the Soviet Union’s policy ever more frequently hits back, in the eyes of world public opinion, at those who resort to such mean methods of political struggle. The draft of the North Atlantic treaty and the circumstances which attended its preparation clearly revealed the drive for world domination of the Anglo-American bloc.

Although the North Atlantic Pact envisages the participation of the five European countries, Canada and the United States, in it, as its nucleus, it is clear to all that leadership in this affair belongs to the ruling circles of the United States of

America, who are now in a bloc with the ruling circles of Great Britain, as the strongest capitalist power in Europe. This being so, the North Atlantic Pact actually becomes the chief instrument of the aggressive policy of the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain "on both sides of the Atlantic," that is, in both hemispheres, and thereby conforms to the aggressive drive for the establishment of Anglo-American world domination, which, it will be remembered, was proclaimed as the chief postwar task of the United States and Great Britain in the sensational speech delivered by Churchill in Fulton, at an unusual gathering, presided over by President Truman.

Apart from the United States, Canada and the five West-European countries, including among them such a "North Atlantic" state as Luxemburg, the draft of the North Atlantic Treaty provides for the participation of certain other states. No small amount of talk and comment is going on at present in this connection.

Some speak of inviting such countries as Sweden, Norway and Denmark to participate in this treaty, noting the peculiar activity displayed in this affair by the Government of Norway. Some quarters suggest circumventing difficulties in this

respect by means of instituting a special Scandinavian pact, which should not, according to these plans, prevent the Scandinavian countries from being drawn into the orbit of states actually being guided by the "North Atlantic" grouping.

They claim that the possibility of Franco Spain, Portugal, Italy and even Turkey participating in the North Atlantic Pact is being discussed, believing evidently that such a policy will help in solving the tasks of the leading grouping of the so-called "North Atlantic" powers. Alongside of this, the formation of a Mediterranean Union or East Mediterranean Pact as an auxiliary instrument of the "North Atlantic" grouping is being discussed.

Such plans for creating more and more separate groupings of states under the aegis of the United States and Great Britain still further stress the fact that the aims of the main imperialist grouping, which is now being knocked together on the basis of the North Atlantic Pact, are far from being of a regional nature, but embody the claims of certain powers to domination in all parts of the globe.

This is likewise attested to by the project for establishing a grouping of countries of South-

Eastern Asia, the practical implementation of which was commenced at the recent conference in Delhi (India), convened on the pretext of discussing the Indonesian question. It goes without saying, however, that the servile attitude of certain leading persons in the governments of these countries will not suffice to get the consent of the peoples of Asia to embark upon the slippery track, onto which they are being persistently goaded by the powers which have become entangled in colonial affairs, and by their wealthy patrons.

All this shows that in building up the North Atlantic Union, the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain endeavour to drag into this affair, directly or otherwise, a possibly greater number of states and thus get them within their grasp. With this end in view they resort to every sort of means, permissible and impermissible. They resort to financial and other economic hand outs. They promise to improve the economic position of the countries, which meanwhile, under pressure of the "dollar policy," are getting increasingly involved in fresh economic difficulties. They scare them with the bogey of a "potential aggressor" and at the same time resort to rude means of pressure on the governments of the

small states.

In one respect, however, the situation should be considered as perfectly clear. Just as they had done when setting up the Western Union, the inspirers of the North Atlantic Pact have from the very outset precluded the possibility of the participation in that pact of all the people's democracies and of the Soviet Union, having conveyed the idea that these states cannot become a party to the treaty and, moreover, that the North Atlantic Pact is levelled precisely against the USSR and the new democracies.

It is clear from all the aforesaid that the aim of the North Atlantic Pact is to place the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain in the driver's seat in regard to the greatest possible number of states and deprive them of the possibility of pursuing an independent national foreign and domestic policy. They are employing these states as auxiliary weapons for the implementation of their aggressive plans directed towards establishing Anglo-American world domination. This being the case, the participation of the USSR and of the people's democracies in the North Atlantic Pact or in other similar alliances of states is out of the question.

There may have been a time when certain people thought that in the post-war period, by means of pressure and threats from without of every sort, they would succeed in pushing the Soviet Union from the socialist course it had chosen, since certain “wise men” calculated that as a result of the grave military and economic trials of the Second World War the Soviet Union would become so weakened as to be unable to cope independently with domestic difficulties and would be bound to abandon its socialist position for the sake of obtaining economic support from the strong capitalist powers. The absurdity of such calculations is evident to all of us; this, however, does not preclude the emergence of short-sighted calculations of every kind and of plans hostile to our Soviet homeland.

In the above-mentioned official document the State Department was obliged to admit the failure of its attempts “during three years... to secure an adjustment in Soviet policy.” The State Department evidently made this statement in order to justify the present plans for the North Atlantic alliance, since it is no longer possible to conceal the anti-Soviet nature of the “North Atlantic” grouping that is being set up.

It will be seen from the aforesaid that in point of fact the North Atlantic Pact represents a most far-flung expression of the aggressive strivings of a narrow group of powers, and first and foremost, an expression of the strivings of the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain, which want, one way or another, to adjust to these ends the policy of the governments of other states, submissive to or directly dependent on them. It is perfectly clear too that both the Western Union and the Inter-American grouping of states, just as the currently engineered pacts of the Mediterranean states, the Scandinavian countries, the countries of South-Eastern Asia, etc., are closely bound up with the aims of the North Atlantic Pact, which serves as the guiding line in Anglo-American plans for the establishment of domination in Western Europe, and in the Northern Atlantic, and in South America, and in the Mediterranean, and in Asia, and in Africa, and everywhere their hands can reach.

One cannot help realizing, however, that it is one thing to be constructing all sorts of groupings and collecting signatures under more and more pacts, cooked up in the chancelleries of the American State Department and the British Foreign

Office, and entirely another thing of course to really achieve the ends pursued by the inspirers of such groupings and pacts.

But the setting up of such groupings and the signing of pacts cannot of course eliminate the numerous contradictions and frictions which actually exist among the countries signatory to these pacts. The appearance of these pacts does not weaken the contradictions even among the chief partners within the Anglo-American bloc, because the aggressive aspirations of both powers clash with each other at every turn. The less possible is it then to reconcile, by signing the various pacts, the contradictory interests of the large and small countries participating in these groupings, under conditions when one of the partners or one group of states is eager to miss no opportunity of profiting at the expense of the other partner or at the expense of the other group of states, and is employing all means of pressure and economic influence towards this end.

Nor should one forget that not all countries will agree to join these groupings, and not all states, which have already joined them, will unconditionally and in all cases submit to Anglo-American dictation.

Furthermore, can one ignore such an important fact as the tremendous upsurge of the national liberation movement which has started of late in the countries of the Orient, among peoples that have only now obtained the opportunity of unbending their backs and standing upright?

Lastly, we must speak of the Soviet Union and the people's democracies, which are carrying into life the true will of their peoples and the great principles of friendship and equality with regard to other nations.

The very fact of the existence of the Soviet state, with its growing might and international prestige, as well as the powerful support rendered it by the democratic forces in the other countries, is an insuperable obstacle to each and every plan for establishing world domination of any power; and this has found its historical confirmation in the liquidation of the fascist states, which have endeavoured to carry through their fantastic plans of world domination, from which the present plans for establishing Anglo-American domination differ very little.

In view of all the aforesaid, it is easy to understand the universally known fact that of late the countries of the Anglo-American bloc, especially

the United States of America, have been quite carried away by dreams of an unprecedented expansion of their armies, of a tremendous increase of their military budgets, of further buildings of a network of air and naval bases in all parts of the globe, and dreams of all sorts of other military plans, including the monstrous plans of employing atom bombs for the same purposes.

In order to justify this unbridled aggressive policy, the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain resort to every method of spreading fear and uncertainty among public circles in Europe and America; they depict an unprecedented growth of the democratic forces and of the national liberation movement in the postwar period as some kind of “dangerous aggression”; even among statesmen they encourage those who for all practical purposes are becoming active warmongers despite the fact that propaganda for war has been unanimously condemned by the United Nations; they increasingly incite their henchmen and their dependent press against such peace-loving countries as the Soviet Union and the states of the people’s democracy and pour out oceans of lies and bellicose threats.

They need all this because more often than

not they dare not try to really solve the ripening domestic problems in their own countries, in accordance with the new historical situation. That is why they build their calculations for the future pre-eminently on these or other aggressive plans, even though they do understand that these are unrealizable otherwise than by violence, otherwise than by unleashing a new war.

The ruling circles of the United States, immediately after the termination of the Second World War, began the establishment of air and naval bases both in the Atlantic and in the Pacific as well as in many remote seas, such areas included as are located thousands of miles from the United States borders. The number of American war bases, far from being reduced since that time, has been considerably multiplied both in the Eastern and in the Western hemispheres, both in the countries of Europe and in countries of America, Asia and Africa. Entire states, especially among those situated close to the boundaries of the USSR, have been adjusted to provide more convenient bridgeheads for Anglo-American air forces and for other conveniences for attacking the USSR. The flow of various arms is being directed to such states, through means of ever new American credits

granted them.

No reasonable person could claim that this was being done to provide for the defence of the United States. It is known on the other hand that no danger of aggression exists for the United States following the Second World War which ended in the defeat of the aggressive powers.

Can it, furthermore, be considered accidental that after the termination of the Second World War the United States and Great Britain have preserved their organization of combined chiefs of staffs in Washington, which continues its work, in a hush-hush manner, preparing its fresh plans of aggression? For if no such plans existed there would be no reason for preserving that staff in Washington under the present peacetime conditions, and no need for sending American, as well as British troops to the territories of an increasing number of states.

American troops are now stationed not only in the countries of Europe and Asia by way of fulfilling the post-war occupation tasks of the United States on former enemy territories. American troops continue to be stationed on the territories of a whole series of states which are members of the United Nations. It has become the

custom in recent years that the ruling circles of the United States assume the right of sending their troops to territories of other states, Greece in Europe or China in Asia for instance, on the pretext that this is essential to the security of the United States.

It is perfectly clear that such a foreign policy has nothing in common with legitimate concern for the defence of the United States, and that this policy is thoroughly permeated with the spirit of violence, with the spirit of aggression.

It is considered as universally recognized that certain circles in the United States are seeking to prepare both Western Germany and Japan as their weapons for the implementation of their aggressive plans, and to make them accomplices in the aggression which is being prepared. Nor is it accidental that the United States is resorting to any pretext in order to postpone the conclusion of peace treaties both with Germany and with Japan. This is the natural sequence to the foreign policy of the ruling circles of the United States, which is based at the present time on aggressive plans and not aimed at strengthening general peace.

The aggressive nature of United States policy

in regard to the growing democratic forces and to entire democratic countries is common knowledge. To this day the Greek people have been unable to get out of the present impasse because reactionary forces alien to the people find mighty support from without. No sooner had the peoples of Czechoslovakia last year somewhat curbed the reactionary circles in their country and rendered support to the advanced democratic forces than the ruling circles of the United States and of the entire Anglo-American bloc raised a deafening noise about the internal developments in Czechoslovakia, and various attempts were made to interfere in these internal affairs.

In their relations with the Soviet Union, the ruling circles of the United States and of the other countries of the Anglo-American bloc more and more vividly demonstrate their unwillingness to reckon with agreements, which but so recently have been unanimously accepted as a basis for carrying out the joint policy of the USSR, the United States and Great Britain in postwar time.

Dealing with the Berlin question, the Soviet Government has once more graphically shown that at the present time the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain do not consider

themselves interested in agreement and cooperation with the USSR. Even when they speak about this, it all comes down to talk about agreement and cooperation, and these end in outright renunciation of the former agreements and in direct sabotage of any real cooperation with the USSR. Things have gone so far that the United States is pursuing in the field of trade with the Soviet Union an intolerable policy of actual boycott, which exposes the inspirers of such a policy as adherents of the principle "all means are good in regard to the USSR," although such a policy damages, first and foremost, the prestige of that country wherefrom it is being inspired.

All the above facts, relating to the postwar foreign policy of the United States and Great Britain, testify to the fact that at the present time the ruling circles of these powers far from pursuing a policy of establishing durable general peace, have, on the contrary, embarked upon a policy that cannot be described otherwise than as a policy of aggression, a policy of unleashing another war.

And the North Atlantic Pact, which conforms to the plans for the violent establishment of Anglo-American world domination and thereby to the aims of the policy of unleashing another war,

is designed precisely as a means of achieving these objectives.

It is not only the ruling aggressive circles of the United States and not only such of its British inspirers as Churchill and Bevin, but a good many other warmongers, of a minor calibre, that stand behind this pact.

One should bear in mind however that the signing of these or any similar pacts does not serve as a guarantee and does not yet provide the opportunity for the realization of the aggressive aims set by the inspirers of such pacts. One should recall in this connection how unanimously the democratic circles of all countries upheld the well-known statement of the head of the Soviet Government J.V. Stalin to the effect that “the horrors of the recent war are still too fresh in the memory of the peoples, and the public forces favouring peace are too strong for Churchill’s pupils in aggression to be able to overpower them and to turn towards a new war.”

III. The North Atlantic Alliance — a Factor Undermining the United Nations Organization

The State Department's official statement attempts to establish grounds for the formation of a North Atlantic Alliance and likewise other above-mentioned groupings by striving to "strengthen the United Nations organization." Such a statement would be convincing only in the case that one could agree that the formation of the North Atlantic Alliance and other groupings and blocs in circumvention of and behind the back of the United Nations could allegedly serve to strengthen this organization. Such an assumption however, it stands to reason, is utterly absurd.

In actuality, the knocking together of the North Atlantic Alliance heading a whole series of specific groupings of states in various parts of the globe, shows that the present policy of the United States and Great Britain has completely broken away from that policy unanimously conducted by the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union together with many other nations when the United Nations Organization was being created and its Charter drawn up and endorsed.

It is a universally known fact that the United Nations organization did not discuss the for-

mation of a North Atlantic Alliance or of the Western Union or of the Pan-American Pact. It is likewise known that the question of the formation of a Mediterranean union or a Scandinavian grouping or an alliance of the countries of South-East Asia and other alliances of states in the process of organization is proceeding at present without the participation of the United Nations and in outright circumvention of this organization.

The participants of these groupings and first of all the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain, realize that it is not to their advantage to bring these questions up for discussion before the United Nations. Here they would probably be asked as to the real purposes and nature of these groupings. This is in no way desired by the governments concerned, directing the formation of all these alliances, blocs and groupings. They prefer to do this secretly, behind the back of the United Nations organization. The ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain actually present the United Nations organization with a *fait accompli* in forming these blocs and groupings.

All this does not however prevent them from

claiming all the while that the North Atlantic Alliance as well as the other blocs and groupings they are forming, allegedly serve to strengthen the United Nations. However no one now believes these words. Even those who make such statements do not attribute any significance to them.

Actually the North Atlantic Alliance and its adjoining groupings of states, headed by the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain, constitute a direct undermining of the United Nations organization. Today these groupings aim at undermining the authority of the United Nations, tomorrow they may bring about the destruction of this organization. Not for nothing have the foundations of this organization been systematically undermined in the last three years, which is especially reflected in the striving to do away with the principle of five-power unanimity in settling all major issues ensuring universal peace and international security laid down in the Charter.

To back up the stand it has taken on the question of the North Atlantic Alliance, the State Department refers to the United Nations Charter. These references however are not only far from convincing but are distinguished by their excep-

tional irresponsibility.

The State Department refers to Article 52 of the United Nations Charter, which speaks about the possible existence of regional pacts, provided they are consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations organization. It goes without saying that such an article is necessary in the United Nations Charter. Facts however demonstrate that the North Atlantic Pact can in no way be considered as such a regional arrangement.

The political meaning of the North Atlantic Pact and its accompanying agreements has nothing whatever in common with what is stated in Article 52 of the United Nations Charter concerning the purposes and principles of regional arrangements.

The North Atlantic Pact cannot in general be referred to as a regional arrangement, as it embraces states in both hemispheres and pursues the aim not of settling diverse regional problems, but of determining the entire course of the foreign policy of such powers as the United States and Great Britain who continually interfere in the affairs of many other states and in every part of the globe at that. It can only be derisively claimed

that the North Atlantic Pact is a regional arrangement. No one who respects Article 52 of the United Nations Charter will hold to this view, as the North Atlantic Alliance was formed not on the basis of Article 52, but in direct violation of the Charter and the fundamental principles of the United Nations organization.

The State Department likewise refers to Article 51 of the United Nations Charter which speaks of the “inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a member of the organization,” and the Security Council is as yet unable to take due measures to maintain world peace.

That such an Article is necessary in the United Nations Charter is quite evident. On the other hand, however, it is equally obvious that the formation of the North Atlantic grouping can in no way find justification in Article 51.

This is evident first of all from the fact that neither the United States of America or Great Britain or any other countries of the Northern Atlantic are threatened by any armed attack whatever. This alone suffices to prove the groundlessness of any references to Article 51, aiming to justify the formation of the North Atlantic Alliance.

The North Atlantic grouping is being formed not for purposes of self-defence and in general not for those tasks laid down in the above-mentioned Article of the Charter. The North Atlantic Alliance, headed by the United States, would simply be of no use to anyone if there did not exist the striving to forcibly establish the domination of the United States and Great Britain over other countries, if there did not exist a striving to establish Anglo-American world domination by force. The North Atlantic Pact is essential, not at all for self-defence, but for the realization of the policy of aggression, for effectuating the policy of unleashing a new war.

Consequently the State Department's attempts to justify the formation of the North Atlantic Alliance by referring to Article 51 of the Charter are utterly groundless, these references can only delude the broad public but cannot serve to really explain the motives for the formation of this new "North Atlantic" grouping and all kinds of adjoining subsidiary unions and blocs.

This is how matters stand as regards the State Department references to Articles 51 and 52 of the United Nations Charter.

If admittedly the State Department references

to the United Nations Charter are irrelevant, then it becomes necessary to refer to the other explanation given of the motives behind the formation of the North Atlantic Alliance, likewise contained in the above-mentioned statement. In this connection the State Department references to the so-called Vandenberg resolution adopted by the American Senate are deserving of especial attention.

Last summer the United States Senate did indeed approve the resolution submitted by Vandenberg on the “new departure” in American foreign policy. The State Department’s statement says that the aforementioned “resolution proposes that for the first time in the nation’s history the United States associate itself in peacetime with countries outside the Western Hemisphere in collective security arrangements designed to safeguard peace and strengthen our own security.”

This statement of the State Department once again refutes its own assertion claiming that the North Atlantic groupings is of a regional nature. It at the same time demonstrates that after the termination of the Second World War, changes have occurred in the foreign policy pursued by the rul-

ing circles of the United States which lay bare the present frankly aggressive nature of this policy.

The said resolution gives a free hand to the United States government in setting up any international alliances in peace time and on the pretext of assuring security permits the United States ruling circles to enter into any groupings and to embark on any adventures, which fully corresponds to the present-day aggressive tendencies of the United States ruling circles.

The adoption of this resolution by the American Senate shows that not only have the United States ruling circles discarded all their main obligations towards the United Nations organization but that they have also taken a new course in their foreign policy which hereafter will be aimed at the forced establishment of Anglo-American domination the world over. It follows herefrom that the resolution adopted by the American Senate signifies that the United States ruling circles favour a policy of aggression, a policy of unleashing a new war.

In view of this new orientation of the foreign policy of the United States and Great Britain it is no wonder that the spearhead of this policy is directed against the Soviet Union and the people's

democracies. Inasmuch as the Soviet Union and the people's democracies are consistently defending the cause of worldwide peace and are waging a tireless struggle against all instigators of a new war, we cannot expect a friendly attitude towards our country on the part of those foreign circles which instigate new aggression and which at the present moment are bending all their efforts to prepare a new war.

The Soviet Union is a party to important agreements with the United States and Great Britain on joint policy as regards both Germany in the West and Japan in the East — a policy which should serve as a good basis for the establishment of durable peace in the world on democratic principles.

These agreements are now being trampled upon at every step by the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain, since these circles are now adhering to a new course in foreign policy and do not wish to reckon with the agreements signed by them. In violation of the letter and spirit of the former agreements the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain are now forming a so-called "North Atlantic Alliance" not only without the participation of the

USSR but even with the direct aim of using this grouping against the USSR and the people's democracies.

The Soviet Union is also a party to twenty-year treaties of friendship and mutual assistance with Great Britain and France, which fully meet the interests of universal, durable peace and are particularly important for the consolidation of peace in Europe. The ruling circles of Great Britain and France however violate these treaties and ignore the obligations contained in them which Great Britain and France had assumed to support and consolidate peace in Europe jointly with the Soviet Union. The Governments of Great Britain and France are taking part in setting up a North Atlantic grouping and moreover, on the pretext of consolidating their security, they have set up the so-called "Western Union" not only without the USSR's participation but even with the direct aim of utilizing this new West-European grouping against the Soviet Union.

The United States, Great Britain and France, together with the Soviet Union, were the main countries which laid the ground for the establishment of the United Nations organization. Together with the other United Nations it was

unanimously agreed that these four states and China should strive for unanimity and cooperation within the United Nations organization and therefore the principle of unanimity of the five great powers in settling major issues of peace and international security was taken as a basis of the United Nations Charter. Almost on the day following the establishment of the United Nations organization, the undermining of the latter began. Although this was effected by stooges, everyone saw and knew that the undermining work was directed by the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain.

To what was this due?

This was due to the fact that as soon as the Second World War was over, the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain conceived the idea that precisely they must play the leading role in the United Nations organization and not all the five great powers jointly. However, inasmuch as the Soviet Union demanded and demands strict abidance by the provisions of the United Nations Charter on the necessity of concerted actions of all five great powers, since only such actions can really guarantee universal peace and international security, the ruling circles of the

United States and Great Britain intensified their attacks on the USSR and launched even more extensive activity with a view to undermining the United Nations organization.

However, all this proved insufficient.

Inasmuch as the Soviet Union and a number of other states do not agree to a revision of the United Nations Charter, the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain have apparently come to the conclusion that they will not succeed in fully adjusting the United Nations organization to their aggressive policy, although they are striving to achieve this. The United Nations Charter proved to be inconvenient for them and they failed to achieve results from their attacks on the USSR for its defence of the very principles on which the United Nations organization had been established, since they could in no way shake the position of the Soviet Government defending the sacred cause of the consolidation of universal, durable peace and consistently exposing each and every aggressor and warmonger.

Having become convinced of this the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain have apparently arrived at the conclusion that they must act in circumvention of the United Nations

organization. It was this policy that resulted in the establishment of the North Atlantic Alliance as well as other groupings of powers which have been and are being set up secretly behind the back of the United Nations organization.

Thus we have every ground to assert that the North Atlantic Alliance is a factor undermining the United Nations organization. One cannot ignore the fact that this reflects the persistent endeavour of United States and Great Britain's ruling circles to bring about the utter disintegration and collapse of the United Nations organization, which however curbs them and prevents the involvement of other states in their aggressive policy, and which cannot become a meek tool in the hands of the Anglo-American bloc in the implementation of their policy aimed at forcibly establishing Anglo-American world domination.

All this makes it clear why the ruling circles of the United States, Great Britain and France, pursuing a policy of aggression and preparing a new war, are now striving everywhere to pursue a policy of isolating the USSR, although this policy constitutes a flagrant violation of the obligations assumed by them.

Consequently the so-called "new departure"

in the foreign policy of the ruling circles of these states consists in reversion to the old anti-Soviet course of foreign policy based on the isolation of the USSR, which they followed in the years preceding the Second World War and which almost led to the complete destruction of European civilization. Carried away by their aggressive plans for world domination, the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain failed to understand that the so-called “new departure” of their policy running counter to their recent obligations towards the USSR, and other members of the United Nations, far from being able to enhance consolidation of their political and economic positions, will be condemned by all peace-loving nations, will be condemned by all champions of the consolidation of universal peace, who constitute the overwhelming majority in all countries.

The Main Conclusions

First Conclusion

The Soviet Union is compelled to reckon with the fact that the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain have adopted an openly aggressive political course the final aim of which

is to establish forcibly Anglo-American domination the world over, a course which is fully in accord with the policy of aggression, the policy of unleashing a new war pursued by them.

In view of this situation the Soviet Union has to wage an even more vigorous and consistent struggle against all and every warmonger, against the policy of aggression and unleashing of a new war, for a worldwide, durable, democratic peace.

In this struggle for the consolidation of universal peace and international security the Soviet Union regards as its allies all other peace-loving states and all those numberless supporters of universal democratic peace voicing the genuine sentiments and aspirations of the peoples who had borne the unparalleled weight of the last world war and who with every justification reject each and every aggressor and instigator of a new war.

Second Conclusion

Everyone sees that the United Nations organization is now being undermined, since this organization, at least to a certain extent, hampers and curbs the aggressive circles in their policy of aggression and of unleashing a new war.

In view of this situation the Soviet Union has

to struggle with even more firmness and persistence against the undermining and destruction of the United Nations organization by the aggressive elements and their accomplices and must see to it that the United Nations organization does not connive with such elements as is often the case now, that it values higher its authority when it is a matter of giving a rebuff to those pursuing a policy of aggression and unleashing of a new war.