

*Joseph Stalin*

**For  
Peaceful  
Coexistence**

POSTWAR INTERVIEWS



INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS, NEW YORK



*Joseph Stalin*

# For Peaceful Coexistence

POSTWAR INTERVIEWS



INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS, NEW YORK

# CONTENTS

*"The government of the U.S.S.R. believes that in spite of differences in economic systems and ideologies, the coexistence of these systems and the peaceful settlement of differences between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. are not only possible, but absolutely necessary in the interest of universal peace."*

—Joseph Stalin, in response to  
Henry A. Wallace's Open Letter,  
May 17, 1948.

EDITOR'S FOREWORD	
ORIGIN AND CHARACTER OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR	
MR. CHURCHILL'S CALL TO ARMS	
THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE WAR SCARE	1
PEOPLE DO NOT WANT WAR	1
GERMANY, ENGLAND, CHINA, U.S.A., WAR DANGER, COEXISTENCE, THE A-BOMB	2
AMERICAN-SOVIET RELATIONS, THE U.N., THE A-BOMB, GERMANY, POLAND, GREECE, JAPAN	2
COEXISTENCE, THE U.N., TRADE AND PEACE, THE A-BOMB, THE BIG THREE, AMERICAN-SOVIET RELATIONS, THE FAR EAST	2
COEXISTENCE, AMERICAN-SOVIET CO-OPERATION, ATOMIC ENERGY, EUROPE	3
BERLIN CRISIS, THE U.N. AND ANGLO-AMERICAN AGGRESSIVE POLICIES, CHURCHILL	3
BERLIN, DISARMAMENT, STALIN-TRUMAN MEETING	4
PEACE IN EUROPE	4
PEACE IN KOREA	4
PEACE IN THE FAR EAST	4
WHEN IS WAR NOT INEVITABLE?	4
PROHIBITION OF ATOMIC WEAPONS	4
LAW IN DEFENSE OF PEACE	4

COPYRIGHT, 1951, BY

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS CO., INC.



205

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

## EDITOR'S FOREWORD

The proposition of the coexistence of socialism and capitalism is rooted in the theory of the uneven development of capitalism, advanced by Lenin before the Socialist Revolution in Russia. He wrote in 1916: "The development of capitalism proceeds extremely unevenly in the various countries. It cannot be otherwise under the system of commodity production. It irrefutably follows from this that Socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously in all countries. It will achieve victory first in one or several countries."

On November 8, 1917, immediately following the assumption of state power, the Second Congress of Soviets adopted the Decree on Peace drafted by Lenin, who had just been chosen head of the new government. From that day on the Soviet government has kept the question of peace with all countries in the forefront of all its external and internal policies, for without peace the building of socialism cannot go forward. But Russia's neighbors in Europe, as well as Japan in Asia and the United States in far-away America, willed otherwise. Like a plague of locusts, land and sea invading forces of fourteen states crossed the Russian borders and joined the tsarist-capitalist-landlord counter-revolution. To support the armed invasions, a frightful economic blockade, euphemistically called "cordon sanitaire," was thrown around Russia. This monstrous imperialist offensive was organized with the avowed aim of crushing the new-born socialist state.

Even during the Civil War years, when the young workers' and peasants' country was fighting for its very existence, Lenin kept the banner of peace high. In a resolution prepared for the Soviet Congress in 1919 he declared: "The Soviet Republic desires to live in peace with all nations and concentrate all its efforts on domestic construction." In radio and telegraphic interviews with correspondents from abroad, Lenin always underscored the central Soviet aim of peaceful economic construction. "Our policy of peace is the same as before," he stated in one of these interviews. "We never changed our peace conditions. Many times we especially offered peace to the Entente [England and



France]. We determinedly favor economic understanding with America, with all countries, but especially America.”

Before Lenin was forced by illness to relinquish the helm of the Soviet state, he prepared instructions for the delegation, headed by the then Foreign Minister Chicherin, which was leaving to attend an economic reconstruction conference in Genoa, called by the Supreme Allied Council in December 1922. Lenin's statement, which Chicherin read to the conference, contained the following words: “While adhering to the principles of communism, the Russian delegation recognizes that in the present historic era, which makes possible the parallel existence of the old system and the newly-born social system, economic co-operation between the states representing these two systems of property, is imperatively necessary for universal economic reconstruction.”

Under Stalin's leadership, the Soviet government carried on Lenin's peace policy. In his report to the Fifteenth Congress of the Communist Party in December 1927, Stalin reiterated the basic tenet of this policy: “The basis of our relations with the capitalist countries is the allowance for the coexistence of two opposite systems. It has been freely justified by practice.” And at the Seventeenth Congress of the Communist Party in January 1934, Stalin said, in reporting on the international situation: “Our foreign policy is clear. It is a policy of preserving peace and strengthening commercial relations with all countries. The U.S.S.R. does not think of threatening anybody, let alone attacking anybody.” This coincides with Lenin's answer a decade before to the allegation that the Soviet Union desired war: “Our entire policy and propaganda are by no means directed at embroiling the peoples in war, but to put an end to war.”

Roy Howard, head of the Scripps-Howard chain of newspapers, who deservedly earned the fallen mantle of Hearst, had a long interview with Stalin in 1936. In answer to his question as to the compatibility “of the coincidental development of American democracy and the Soviet system,” Stalin stated categorically: “American democracy and the Soviet system may peacefully exist side by side and compete with each other.”

Rumors of war and threats of war were filling the air in the late thirties. The Soviet Union was declaring to the world



that "peace is indivisible," that "collective security" of the democratic countries against the fascist threat of war was the need of the hour. But the Nazis had ideological friends in the chancelleries of Europe, even as their cartelist backers had closer relations in the finance centers of London, Paris, and New York. From the midst of these gentry emerged the Men of Munich.

It was during this period that Stalin spoke at the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party in March 1939, and summarized the Soviet position on peace in these terse words: "We stand for peace and for strengthening of business relations with all countries. This is our position; and we shall adhere to this position as long as the countries maintain like relations with the Soviet Union; and as long as they make no attempt to trespass on the interests of our country."

In the following pages are presented a series of interviews with Stalin by political leaders and journalists since the victorious conclusion of the anti-fascist war. The same question, "Can capitalism and socialism coexist peacefully?" was the central theme of all these conversations which ran the gamut of problems presented by the post-war world to each of the countries. Again positive answers are given by Stalin to all his visitors.

The vitality of the principle of coexistence is demonstrated by the fact that it has become a subject of discussion among broad strata of the population in the various countries. The international peace forces have adopted it as a part of their program.

At the session of the World Council for Peace, held in Vienna, November 1, 1951, President Frédéric Joliot-Curie, the world-renowned scientist, declared in his opening address: "We are convinced that peaceful coexistence of different regimes existing in the world is possible. We are convinced that all differences between nations can be settled by peaceful means."

As an introduction to the volume, the editor has included an excerpt from Stalin's speech to the electorate in his district on February 9, 1946, dealing with the origin and character of the second World War. In addition to the interviews, the editor also included the text of an Order of the Day, the law in defense of peace, and messages addressed to the governments of China, India, and the Democratic Republic of Germany.



# ORIGIN AND CHARACTER

## OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR

*[From a speech to the voters of his district during the elections to the Supreme Soviet, February 9, 1946]*

It would be wrong to think that the Second World War was a casual occurrence or the result of mistakes of any particular statesmen, though mistakes undoubtedly were made. Actually, the war was the inevitable result of the development of world economic and political forces on the basis of modern monopoly capitalism. Marxists have declared more than once that the capitalist system of world economy harbors elements of general crises and armed conflicts and that, hence, the development of world capitalism in our time proceeds not in the form of smooth and even progress but through crises and military catastrophe.

The fact is that the unevenness of development of the capitalist countries usually leads in time to violent disturbance of equilibrium in the world system of capitalism. That group of capitalist countries which considers itself worse provided than others with raw materials and markets usually makes attempts to alter the situation and to repartition the "spheres of influence" in its favor by armed force. The result is a splitting of the capitalist world into two hostile camps and war between them.

Perhaps military catastrophes might be avoided if it were possible for raw materials and markets to be periodically redistributed among the various countries in accordance with their economic importance, by agreement and peaceable settlement.



But that is impossible to do under present capitalist conditions of the development of world economy.

Thus the First World War [1914-18] was the result of the first crisis of the capitalist system of world economy, and the Second World War [1939-45] was the result of a second crisis.

That does not mean of course that the Second World War is a copy of the first. On the contrary, the Second World War differs materially from the first in character. It must be borne in mind that before attacking the Allied countries the principal fascist states—Germany, Japan, and Italy—destroyed the last vestiges of bourgeois-democratic liberties at home, established a brutal terrorist regime in their own countries, rode roughshod over the principles of sovereignty and free development of small countries, proclaimed a policy of seizure of alien territories as their own policy, and declared for all to hear that they were out for world domination and the establishment of a fascist regime throughout the world.

Moreover, by the seizure of Czechoslovakia and of the central areas of China, the Axis states showed that they were prepared to carry out their threat of enslaving all freedom-loving nations. In view of this, unlike the First World War, the Second World War against the Axis states from the very outset assumed the character of an anti-fascist war, a war of liberation, one aim of which was also the restoration of democratic liberties. The entry of the Soviet Union into the war against the Axis states could only enhance, and indeed did enhance, the anti-fascist and liberation character of the Second World War.

It was on this basis that the anti-fascist coalition of the Soviet Union, the United States of America, Great Britain, and other freedom-loving states came into being—a coalition which subsequently played a decisive part in defeating the armed forces of the Axis states.

That is how matters stand as regards the origin and character of the Second World War.



# MR. CHURCHILL'S CALL TO ARMS

*[Interview with correspondent of Pravda, March 13, 1946, on Winston Churchill's radio speech at Fulton, Missouri]*

*Question:* How do you appraise Mr. Churchill's latest speech in the United States of America?

*Answer:* I appraise it as a dangerous act, calculated to sow the seeds of dissension among the Allied states and impede their collaboration.

*Question:* Can it be considered that Mr. Churchill's speech is prejudicial to the cause of peace and security?

*Answer:* Yes, unquestionably. As a matter of fact, Mr. Churchill now takes the stand of the warmongers, and in this Mr. Churchill is not alone. He has friends not only in Britain but in the United States of America as well.

A point to be noted is that in this respect Mr. Churchill and his friends bear a striking resemblance to Hitler and his friends. Hitler began his work of unleashing war by proclaiming a race theory, declaring that only German-speaking people constituted a superior nation. Mr. Churchill sets out to unleash war with a race theory, asserting that only English-speaking nations are superior nations, who are called upon to decide the destinies of the entire world. The German race theory led Hitler and his friends to the conclusion that the Germans, as the only superior nation, should rule over other nations. The English race theory leads Mr. Churchill and his friends to the conclusion that the English-speaking nations, as the only superior nations, should rule over the rest of the nations of the world.



Actually, Mr. Churchill, and his friends in Britain and the United States, present to the non-English-speaking nations something in the nature of an ultimatum: "Accept our rule voluntarily, and then all will be well; otherwise war is inevitable."

But the nations shed their blood in the course of five years' fierce war for the sake of the liberty and independence of their countries, and not in order to exchange the domination of the Hitlers for the domination of the Churchills. It is quite probable, accordingly, that the non-English-speaking nations, which constitute the vast majority of the population of the world, will not agree to submit to a new slavery.

It is Mr. Churchill's tragedy that, inveterate Tory that he is, he does not understand this simple and obvious truth.

There can be no doubt that Mr. Churchill's position is a war position, a call for war on the U.S.S.R. It is also clear that this position of Mr. Churchill's is incompatible with the Treaty of Alliance existing between Britain and the U.S.S.R. True, Mr. Churchill does say, in passing, in order to confuse his readers, that the term of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty of Mutual Assistance and Collaboration might quite well be extended to fifty years. But how is such a statement on Mr. Churchill's part to be reconciled with his position of war on the U.S.S.R., with his preaching of war against the U.S.S.R.? Obviously, these things cannot be reconciled by any means whatever. And if Mr. Churchill, who calls for war on the Soviet Union, at the same times considers it possible to extend the term of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty to fifty years, that means that he regards this treaty as a mere scrap of paper, which he only needs in order to disguise and camouflage his anti-Soviet position. For this reason, the false statements of Mr. Churchill's friends in Britain, regarding the extension of the term of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty to fifty years or more, cannot be taken seriously. Extension of the treaty term has no point if one of the parties violates the treaty and converts it into a mere scrap of paper.

*Question:* How do you appraise the part of Mr. Churchill's



speech in which he attacks the democratic systems in the European states bordering upon us, and criticizes the good neighborly relations established between these states and the Soviet Union?

*Answer:* This part of Mr. Churchill's speech is compounded of elements of slander and elements of discourtesy and tactlessness. Mr. Churchill asserts that "Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade,\* Bucharest, Sofia—all these famous cities and the populations around them—lie within the Soviet sphere and are all subject in one form or another not only to Soviet influence, but to a very high and increasing measure of control from Moscow." Mr. Churchill describes all this as "unlimited expansionist tendencies" on the part of the Soviet Union.

It needs no particular effort to show that in this Mr. Churchill grossly and unceremoniously slanders both Moscow and the above-named states bordering on the U.S.S.R.

In the first place it is quite absurd to speak of exclusive control by the U.S.S.R. in Vienna and Berlin, where there are Allied Control Councils made up of the representatives of four states and where the U.S.S.R. has only one-quarter of the votes. It does happen that some people cannot help engaging in slander. But still, there is a limit to everything.

Secondly, the following circumstances should not be forgotten. The Germans made their invasion of the U.S.S.R. through Finland, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary. The Germans were able to make their invasion through these countries because, at the time, governments hostile to the Soviet Union existed in these countries. As a result of the German invasion the Soviet Union has lost irretrievably in the fighting against the Germans, and also through the German occupation and the deportation of Soviet citizens to German servitude, a total of about seven million people. In other words, the Soviet Union's loss of life has been several times greater than that of Britain and the United

\* The government of Yugoslavia has since deserted the bloc of People's Democracies and joined the camp of their enemies.—*Ed.*



States of America put together. Possibly in some quarters an inclination is felt to forget about these colossal sacrifices of the Soviet people which secured the liberation of Europe from the Hitlerite yoke. But the Soviet Union cannot forget about them. And so what can there be surprising about the fact that the Soviet Union, anxious for its future safety, is trying to see to it that governments loyal in their attitude to the Soviet Union should exist in these countries? How can anyone, who has not taken leave of his wits, describe these peaceful aspirations of the Soviet Union as expansionist tendencies on the part of our state?

Mr. Churchill claims further that the "Russian-dominated Polish government has been encouraged to make enormous, wrongful inroads on Germany."

Every word of this is a gross and insulting calumny. Outstanding men are at the helm in present democratic Poland. They have proved by their deeds that they are capable of upholding the interests and dignity of their country as their predecessors were not. What grounds has Mr. Churchill to assert that the leaders of present-day Poland can countenance in their country the domination of representatives of any foreign state whatever? Is it not because Mr. Churchill means to sow the seeds of dissension in the relations between Poland and the Soviet Union that he slanders "the Russians" here?

Mr. Churchill is displeased that Poland has faced about in her policy in the direction of friendship and alliance with the U.S.S.R. There was a time when elements of conflict and antagonism predominated in the relations between Poland and the U.S.S.R. This circumstance enabled statesmen like Mr. Churchill to play on these antagonisms, to get control over Poland on the pretext of protecting her from the Russians, to try to scare Russia with the specter of war between herself and Poland, and retain the position of arbiter for themselves. But that time is past and gone, for the enmity between Poland and Russia has given way to friendship between them, and Poland—present-day democratic



Poland—does not choose to be a football in foreign hands any longer. It seems to me that it is this fact that irritates Mr. Churchill and makes him indulge in discourteous, tactless sallies against Poland. Just imagine—he is not being allowed to play his game at the expense of others!

As to Mr. Churchill's attack upon the Soviet Union in connection with the extension of Poland's western frontier to include Polish territories which the Germans had seized in the past—here it seems to me he is plainly cheating. As is known, the decision on the western frontier of Poland was adopted at the Berlin Three-Power Conference on the basis of Poland's demands. The Soviet Union has repeatedly stated that it considers Poland's demands to be proper and just. It is quite probable that Mr. Churchill is displeased with this decision. But why does Mr. Churchill, while sparing no shots against the Russian position in this matter, conceal from his readers the fact that this decision was passed at the Berlin Conference by unanimous vote—that it was not only the Russians but the British and Americans as well who voted for the decision? Why did Mr. Churchill think it necessary to mislead the public?

Further, Mr. Churchill asserts that the "Communist parties, which were previously very small in all these eastern states of Europe, have been raised to prominence and power far beyond their numbers and seek everywhere to obtain totalitarian control. Police governments prevail in nearly every case, and thus far, except in Czechoslovakia, there is no true democracy."

As is known, the government of the state in Britain at the present time is in the hands of one party, the Labor Party, and the opposition parties are deprived of the right to participate in the government of Britain. That Mr. Churchill calls true democracy. Poland, Romania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Hungary are administered by blocs of several parties—from four to six parties—and the opposition, if it is more or less loyal, is secured the right of participation in the government. That Mr. Churchill describes as totalitarianism, tyranny, and police rule. Why? On what



grounds? Don't expect a reply from Mr. Churchill. Mr. Churchill does not understand in what a ridiculous position he puts himself by his outcry about "totalitarianism, tyranny, and police rule."

Mr. Churchill would like Poland to be administered by Sosnkowski and Anders, Yugoslavia by Mikhailovich and Pavelich, Romania by Prince Stirbe and Radescu, Hungary and Austria by some king of the House of Hapsburg, and so on. Mr. Churchill wants to assure us that these gentlemen from the fascist backyard can ensure true democracy.

Such is the "democracy" of Mr. Churchill.

Mr. Churchill comes somewhere near the truth when he speaks of the increasing influence of the Communist parties in eastern Europe. It must be remarked, however, that he is not quite accurate. The influence of the Communist parties has grown not only in eastern Europe, but in nearly all the countries of Europe which were previously under fascist rule—Italy, Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania, and Finland—or which experienced German, Italian, or Hungarian occupation—France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Denmark, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Greece, the Soviet Union and so on.

The increased influence of the Communists cannot be considered fortuitous. It is a perfectly logical thing. The influence of the Communists has grown because, in the years of the rule of fascism in Europe, the Communists showed themselves trusty, fearless, self-sacrificing fighters against the fascist regime for the liberty of the peoples. Mr. Churchill in his speeches sometimes recalls the plain people from little homes, slapping them patronizingly on the back and parading as their friend. But these people are not so simple as may at first sight appear. These plain people have views of their own, a policy of their own, and they know how to stand up for themselves. It was they, the millions of these plain people, who defeated Mr. Churchill and his party in Britain by casting their votes for the Laborites. It was they, the millions of these plain people, who isolated the reactionaries and advocates of collaboration with fascism in Europe, and gave

their preference to the Left democratic parties. It was they, the millions of these plain people, who after testing the Communists in the fires of struggle and resistance to fascism, came to the conclusion that the Communists were fully deserving of the people's confidence. That was how the influence of the Communists grew in Europe.

Of course Mr. Churchill does not like this course of development and he sounds the alarm and appeals to force. But neither did he like the birth of the Soviet regime in Russia after the First World War. At that time, too, he sounded the alarm and organized an armed campaign of fourteen states against Russia setting himself the goal of turning back the wheel of history. But history proved stronger than the Churchill intervention, and Mr. Churchill's quixotry led to his unmitigated defeat at that time. I don't know whether Mr. Churchill and his friends will succeed in organizing a new armed campaign against eastern Europe after the Second World War; but if they do succeed—which is not very probable because millions of plain people stand guard over the cause of peace—it may confidently be said that they will be thrashed, just as they were thrashed once before, twenty-six years ago.



# THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE WAR SCARE

*[Interview with Eddie Gilmore, representative of the Associated Press, March 22, 1946]*

**Question:** What importance do you ascribe to the United Nations Organization as a means of safeguarding world peace?

**Answer:** I ascribe great importance to the United Nations Organization inasmuch as it is a serious instrument for maintaining peace and international security. The strength of this international organization lies in the fact that it is based on the principle of the equality of states and not on the principle of the domination of some over others. If the United Nations Organization succeeds in the future, too, in maintaining the principle of equality, then it will undoubtedly play a great positive role in guaranteeing universal peace and security.

**Question:** What in your opinion is the reason for the present war scare which is felt by many people in many countries?

**Answer:** I am convinced that neither nations nor their armies seek a new war. They want peace, and seek to secure the peace. That means that the present war scare does not come from that direction. I think that the present war scare is aroused by the actions of certain political groups who are engaged in propaganda for a new war and are thus sowing the seeds of dissension and uncertainty.

**Question:** What should the governments of the freedom-loving

countries do at the present time to safeguard peace and tranquility throughout the world?

*Answer:* It is necessary that the public and the ruling circles of the states organize widespread counter-propaganda against the propagandists for a new war, as well as propaganda for the maintenance of peace; that not a single utterance of the propagandists for a new war gets away without the rebuff it deserves on the part of public opinion and the press; that in this way the warmongers be promptly exposed and given no opportunity to misuse freedom of speech against the interests of peace.



# PEOPLE DO NOT WANT WAR

*(Order of the Day to the Red Army, May 1, 1946)*

One year ago the Red Army hoisted the banner of victory over Berlin and completed the defeat of fascist Germany. Within four months after the victorious termination of the war against Germany, imperialist Japan downed her arms. The Second World War, prepared by the forces of international reaction and unleashed by the chief fascist states, ended in a full victory of the freedom-loving peoples. The smash-up and liquidation of the main hotbeds of fascism and world aggression resulted in deep changes in the political life of the peoples of the world, in a wide growth of the democratic movement among the peoples.

Taught by the experience of war, the popular masses realized that the destinies of states cannot be entrusted to reactionary leaders, who pursue the narrow caste and selfish anti-popular aims. It is for this reason that peoples who no longer wish to live in the old way take the destinies of their own states into their own hands, establish democratic order, and carry on an active struggle against the forces of reaction, against instigators of a new war. The peoples of the world do not wish a repetition of the calamities of war. They fight persistently for the strengthening of peace and security.

In the vanguard of the struggle for peace and security marches the Soviet Union, which played an outstanding part in smashing fascism and fulfilled its great mission of liberation. The peoples liberated by the Soviet Union from the fascist yoke received an

opportunity of building their state life on democratic principles, of realizing their historical aspirations. On this road they find fraternal assistance on the part of the Soviet Union.

The entire world has had an opportunity to convince itself, not only of the power of the Soviet State, but also of the character of its policy based on the recognition of equality of all peoples, respect for their freedom and independence.

There is no reason to doubt that in the future the Soviet Union will be true to its policy—the policy of peace and security, the policy of the equality and friendship of the peoples.

Upon the termination of the war, the Soviet Union started peaceful socialist construction. The Soviet people enthusiastically set about peaceful constructive labor, which had been interrupted by the war.



# GERMANY, ENGLAND, CHINA, U.S.A., WAR DANGER, COEXISTENCE, THE A-BOMB

*[Interview with Alexander Werth, correspondent of the London Sunday Times, September 24, 1946]*

**Question:** Do you believe in a real danger of a "new war" concerning which there is so much irresponsible talk throughout the world today? What steps should be taken to prevent war if such a danger exists?

**Answer:** I do not believe in a real danger of a "new war." Those who are now clamoring about a "new war" are chiefly military-political scouts and their few followers from among the civilian ranks. They need this clamor if only: (a) to scare certain naive politicians from among their counter-agents with the specter of war, and thus help their own governments wring as many concessions as possible from such counter-agents; (b) to obstruct for some time the reduction of war budgets in their own countries; (c) to put a brake on the demobilization of troops, and thus prevent a rapid growth of unemployment in their own countries.

One must strictly differentiate between the hue and cry about a "new war" which is now taking place, and a real danger of a "new war" which does not exist at present.

**Question:** Do you believe that Great Britain and the United States of America are consciously placing the Soviet Union in a state of "capitalist encirclement"?

*Answer:* I do not think that the ruling circles of Great Britain and of the United States of America could create a "capitalist encirclement" of the Soviet Union even if they so desired, which, however, I do not assert.

*Question:* To quote Mr. Wallace's recent speech, may Britain, western Europe, and the United States be certain that Soviet policy in Germany will not become an instrument of Russian designs against western Europe?

*Answer:* I exclude the use of Germany by the Soviet Union against western Europe and the United States of America. I consider this out of the question, not only because the Soviet Union is bound with Great Britain and France by a Treaty of Mutual Assistance against German aggression, and with the United States of America by the decisions of the Potsdam Conference of three Great Powers, but also because a policy of making use of Germany against western Europe and the United States of America would mean the departure of the Soviet Union from its fundamental national interests.

In short, the policy of the Soviet Union in relation to the German problem reduces itself to the demilitarization and democratization of Germany. I believe that the demilitarization and democratization of Germany form one of the most important guarantees of the establishment of a stable and lasting peace.

*Question:* What is your view of the charges that Communist parties of western Europe are having their policy "dictated by Moscow"?

*Answer:* I consider these charges absurd and borrowed from the bankrupt arsenal of Hitler and Goebbels.

*Question:* Do you believe in the possibility of friendly and lasting co-operation between the Soviet Union and the western democracies despite the existence of ideological differences, and in the "friendly competition" between the two systems to which Mr. Wallace referred?

*Answer:* I believe in it absolutely.

*Question:* During the recent sojourn here of the Labor Party



delegation you, as far as I understand, expressed certainty of the possibility of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Great Britain. What could help in establishing these relations so profoundly desired by the broad masses of the British people?

*Answer:* I am indeed convinced of the possibility of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Great Britain. The strengthening of political, commercial, and cultural bonds between these countries would contribute considerably to the establishment of such relations.

*Question:* Do you believe the earliest withdrawal of all American forces in China to be vital for future peace?

*Answer:* Yes, I do.

*Question:* Do you believe that virtual monopoly by the U.S.A. of the atom bomb is one of the main dangers to peace?

*Answer:* I do not believe the atom bomb to be as serious a force as certain politicians are inclined to think. Atomic bombs are intended for intimidating the weak-nerved, but they cannot decide the outcome of war, since atom bombs are by no means sufficient for this purpose. Certainly, monopolistic possession of the secret of the atom bomb does create a threat, but at least two remedies exist against it: (a) Monopolist possession of the atom bomb cannot last long; (b) use of the atom bomb will be prohibited.

*Question:* Do you believe that with the further progress of the Soviet Union towards communism the possibilities of peaceful co-operation with the outside world will not decrease as far as the Soviet Union is concerned? Is "communism in one country" possible?

*Answer:* I do not doubt that the possibilities of peaceful co-operation, far from decreasing, may even grow. "Communism in one country" is perfectly possible, especially in a country like the Soviet Union.

# AMERICAN-SOVIET RELATIONS, THE U.N., THE A-BOMB, GERMANY, POLAND, GREECE, JAPAN

[Interview with Hugh Baillie, president, United Press, October 28, 1946]

*Question:* Do you agree with Secretary Byrnes's feeling, as expressed in his radio speech last Friday (October 18), that there is growing tension between the U.S.S.R. and the United States?

*Answer:* No.

*Question:* If such an increasing tension exists, could you indicate the reason, or reasons for it, and what are the most essential bases for eliminating it?

*Answer:* The question does not arise in view of my answer to the preceding question.

*Question:* Do you foresee that the present negotiations will result in peace treaties which will establish amicable relations among the nations which were allies in the war against fascism, and remove the danger of war on the part of former fascist sources?

*Answer:* I hope so.

*Question:* If not, what are the principal obstacles to the establishment of such amicable relations among the nations which were allies in the Great War?

*Answer:* The question does not arise in view of the answer to the preceding question.

*Question:* What is Russia's attitude with regard to Yugoslavia's decision not to sign the Peace Treaty with Italy?

*Answer:* Yugoslavia has grounds to be dissatisfied.

*Question:* What, in your opinion, is today the worst threat to world peace?

*Answer:* The instigators of a new war, in the first place Churchill and people of like mind in Britain and the U.S.A.

*Question:* If such a threat should arise, what steps should be taken by the nations of the world to avoid a new war?

*Answer:* The instigators of a new war should be exposed and curbed.

*Question:* Is the United Nations Organization a guarantee of the integrity of the small nations?

*Answer:* It is hard to say so far.

*Question:* Do you think that the four zones of occupation in Germany should in the near future be thrown together, so far as economic administration is concerned, with a view to restoring Germany as a peaceful economic unit and thus lessening the burden of occupation to the four powers?

*Answer:* Not only the economic but also the political unity of Germany should be restored.

*Question:* Do you feel that it is feasible at this time to create some sort of central administration to be placed in the hands of the Germans themselves, but under Allied control, which will make it possible for the Council of Foreign Ministers to draft a peace treaty for Germany?

*Answer:* Yes, I do.

*Question:* Do you feel confident, in the light of elections which have been held in the various zones this summer and fall, that Germany is developing politically along democratic lines which give hope for its future as a peaceful nation?

*Answer:* So far I am not certain of it.

*Question:* Do you feel that, as has been suggested in some quarters, the level of permitted industry should be increased above the agreed level, to permit Germany to pay her own way more fully?

*Answer:* Yes, I do.



*Question:* What should be done beyond the present four-power program to prevent Germany from again becoming a world military menace?

*Answer:* The remnants of fascism in Germany should be extirpated in fact and she should be completely democratized.

*Question:* Should the German people be allowed to reconstruct their industry and trade and become self-supporting?

*Answer:* Yes, they should.

*Question:* Have the provisions of Potsdam, in your opinion, been adhered to? If not, what is needed to make the Potsdam Declaration an effective instrument?

*Answer:* They are not always adhered to, especially in the sphere of the democratization of Germany.

*Question:* Do you feel the veto power has been used to excess during the discussions among the four Foreign Ministers and in meetings of the United Nations Council?

*Answer:* No, I do not.

*Question:* How far does the Kremlin feel the Allied Powers should go hunting down and trying minor war criminals in Germany? Does it feel that the Nuremberg decisions created a sufficiently strong basis for such action?

*Answer:* The farther they go the better.

*Question:* Does Russia consider the western frontiers of Poland permanent?

*Answer:* Yes, she does.

*Question:* How does the U.S.S.R. regard the presence of British troops in Greece? Does it feel that Britain should supply more arms to the present Greek government?

*Answer:* As unnecessary.

*Question:* What is the extent of Russian military contingents in Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Austria, and how long do you feel that, in the interests of securing peace, these contingents must be maintained?

*Answer:* In the West, that is in Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania, and Poland, the Soviet Union has at present

in all 60 divisions (infantry and armor together). Most of them are below full complement. There are no Soviet troops in Yugoslavia. In two months, when the Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of October 22 of this year on the last stage of demobilization is put into effect, forty Soviet divisions will remain in the above-mentioned countries.

*Question:* What is the attitude of the government of the U.S.S.R. towards the presence of American warships in the Mediterranean?

*Answer:* Indifferent.

*Question:* What is the present outlook for a commercial agreement between Russia and Norway?

*Answer:* It is hard to tell, so far.

*Question:* Is it possible for Finland again to become a self-sufficient nation after reparations have been paid, and is there any idea in contemplation of revising the reparations program so far as to expedite Finland's recovery?

*Answer:* The question has been put in the wrong way. Finland has been and remains an entirely self-sufficient nation.

*Question:* What will trade agreements with Sweden and other countries mean with regard to reconstruction in the U.S.S.R.? What outside aid do you consider desirable in accomplishing this great task?

*Answer:* The agreement with Sweden constitutes a contribution to the cause of economic co-operation among the nations.

*Question:* Is Russia still interested in obtaining a loan from the United States?

*Answer:* She is interested.

*Question:* Has Russia developed its own atom bomb or any similar weapon?

*Answer:* No.

*Question:* What is your opinion of the atom bomb or similar weapon as an instrument of warfare?

*Answer:* I have already given my appraisal of the atom bomb in the well-known answer to Mr. Werth.

*Question:* How, in your opinion, can atomic power best be controlled? Should this control be created on an international basis, and to what extent should the powers sacrifice their sovereignty in the interest of making the control effective?

*Answer:* Strict international control is necessary.

*Question:* How long will it require to rebuild the devastated areas of western Russia?

*Answer:* Six to seven years, if not more.

*Question:* Will Russia permit commercial airlines to operate across the Soviet Union? Does Russia intend to extend her own airlines to other continents on a reciprocal basis?

*Answer:* Under certain conditions this is not excluded.

*Question:* How does your government view the occupation of Japan? Do you feel it has been a success on the present basis?

*Answer:* There are some successes, but better successes could have been obtained.



# COEXISTENCE, THE U.N., TRADE AND PEACE, THE A-BOMB, THE BIG THREE, AMERICAN-SOVIET RELATIONS, THE FAR-EAST

*[Interview with Elliott Roosevelt, December 21, 1946]*

*Question:* Do you believe it is possible for a democracy such as the United States to live peaceably side by side in this world with a communistic form of government like the Soviet Union's and with no attempt on the part of either to interfere with the internal political affairs of the other?

*Answer:* Yes, of course. This is not only possible. It is wise and entirely within the bounds of realization. In the most strenuous times during the war the differences in government did not prevent our two nations from joining together and vanquishing our foes. Even more so is it possible to continue this relationship in time of peace.

*Question:* Do you believe that the success of the United Nations depends upon agreement as to fundamental policies and aims between the Soviet Union, Britain, and the United States?

*Answer:* Yes, I think so. In many respects the fate of the United Nations as an organization depends upon a state of harmony being reached by those three powers.

*Question:* Do you believe, Generalissimo Stalin, that an important step toward world peace would be the attainment of economic agreement of broader scope for the interchange of manufactured and raw materials between our two countries?

*Answer:* Yes, I believe that it would be an important step for the establishment of world peace. Of course, I agree. The expansion of world trade would benefit in many respects the development of good relations between our two countries.

*Question:* Is the Soviet Union in favor of the immediate creation by the United Nations Security Council of an international police force composed of all the United Nations, which would step in immediately wherever armed warfare threatens peace?

*Answer:* Of course.

*Question:* If you believe that the atomic bomb should be controlled by the United Nations, should not they, through inspection, control all research and manufacturing facilities for armaments of any nature and the peace-time use and development of atomic energy?

*Answer:* Of course. To the principle of equality no exception should be made in the case of Russia. Russia should be subject to the same rules of inspection and control as any other nation must.

*Question:* Do you think it would serve a useful purpose if another Big Three meeting was held for discussion of all international problems at present threatening peace in the world?

*Answer:* I think there should not be one meeting, but several; they would serve a useful purpose.

*Question:* Sir, I know you are a student of many other political and social problems existing in other countries. And so I should like to ask whether you feel that the elections in the United States last November indicate a swing away, on the part of the people, from belief in the policies of Roosevelt and towards the isolationist policies of his political adversaries?

*Answer:* I am not so well acquainted with the internal life of the people of the United States, but I would think the election indicated that the present government was wasting the moral and political capital created by the late President, and thus it facilitated the victory of the Republicans.\*

\* Reference here is to the Congressional elections of November, 1946.—Ed.

*Question:* To what do you ascribe the lessening of friendly relations and understanding between our two countries since the death of Roosevelt?

*Answer:* I feel that if this question relates to the relations and understanding between the American and Russian peoples, no deterioration has taken place, but on the contrary relations have improved. As to the relations between the two governments, there have been misunderstandings. A certain deterioration has taken place, and then great noise has been raised that their relations would even deteriorate still further. But I see nothing frightful about this in the sense of violation of peace or military conflict.

Not a single Great Power, even if its government is anxious to do so, could at present raise a large army to fight another Allied Power, another Great Power, because at present one cannot possibly fight without one's people—and the people are unwilling to fight. They are tired of war.

Moreover, there are no understandable objectives to justify a new war. One would not know for what he had to fight, and therefore I see nothing frightful in the fact that some representatives of the United States government are talking about deterioration of relations between us.

In view of all these considerations I think the danger of a new war is unreal.

*Question:* Do you favor a broad exchange of cultural and scientific information between our two nations? Also, do you favor exchange of students, artists, scientists, and professors?

*Answer:* Of course.

*Question:* Should the United States and the Soviet Union form a common long-term policy of aid to the peoples of the Far East?

*Answer:* I feel it will be useful if it is possible. In any case our government is ready to pursue a common policy with the United States in Far Eastern questions.

*Question:* If a system of loans or credits is arranged between the United States and the Soviet Union, would such agreements



have lasting benefit to United States economy?

*Answer:* A system of such credits is of course mutually advantageous both to the United States and to the Soviet Union.

*Question:* Does the failure in the American and British zones of occupied Germany to carry out denazification give serious cause for alarm to the Soviet government?

*Answer:* No, it has not been a cause for serious alarm, but of course it is unpleasant for the Soviet Union that part of our common program is not being put into effect.

# COEXISTENCE, AMERICAN-SOVIET CO-OPERATION, ATOMIC ENERGY, EUROPE

*[Interview with Harold Stassen, April 9, 1947]*

*Stassen:* Generalissimo Stalin, on this European trip I am particularly interested in studying conditions of an economic nature. In this regard, of course, the relations of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. are very important. I realize that we have two economic systems that are very different. The U.S.S.R. with the Communist Party and with its planned economy and socialized collective state, and the United States of America with its free economy and regulated private capitalism are very different. I would be interested to know if you think these two economic systems can exist together in the same modern world in harmony with each other?

*Stalin:* Of course they can. The difference between them is not important so far as co-operation is concerned. The systems in Germany and the United States are the same but war broke out between them. The U.S. and U.S.S.R. systems are different but we didn't wage war against each other and the U.S.S.R. does not propose to. If during the war they could co-operate, why can't they today in peace, given the wish to co-operate? Of course, if there is no desire to co-operate, even with the same economic system they may fall out as was the case with Germany.

*Stassen:* I believe, of course, that they can co-operate if they both have the desire to, but there have been many statements

about not being able to co-operate. Some of these were made by the Generalissimo himself before the war. But is it possible, now that the fascist axis has been defeated, that the situation has changed?

*Stalin:* It's not possible that I said that the two economic systems could not co-operate. Co-operation ideas were expressed by Lenin. I might have said that one system was reluctant to co-operate, but that concerned only one side. But as to the possibility of co-operation, I adhere to Lenin who expressed both the possibility and the desire of co-operation. As to the desire of the people to co-operate on the part of the U.S.S.R. and the Party, it is possible—and the two countries could only benefit by this co-operation.

*Stassen:* That last part is clear. The statements I referred to are those made by you at the Eighteenth Communist Party Congress in 1939 and the plenary session in 1937—statements about capitalist encirclement and monopoly. I assume from your statement now that the defeat of fascist Germany and Japan has not changed that situation.

*Stalin:* There was not a single Party congress or plenary session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party at which I said or could have said that co-operation between the two systems was impossible. I did say that there existed capitalist encirclement and danger of attack on the U.S.S.R. If one party does not wish to co-operate, then that means there exists a threat of attack. And actually Germany, not wishing to co-operate with the U.S.S.R., attacked the U.S.S.R. Could the U.S.S.R. have co-operated with Germany? Yes, the U.S.S.R. could have co-operated with Germany but the Germans did not wish to co-operate. Otherwise the U.S.S.R. could have co-operated with Germany as with any other country. As you see, this concerns the sphere of desire and not the possibility of co-operating. It is necessary to make a distinction between the possibility of co-operating and the wish to co-operate. The possibility of co-operation always exists but there is not always present the

wish to co-operate. If one party does not wish to co-operate, then the result will be conflict, war.

*Stassen:* It must be mutual.

*Stalin:* Yes. I want to bear testimony to the fact that Russia wants to co-operate.

*Stassen:* I wish to point out with reference to your earlier statement that there was a great difference between Germany and the United States at the time Germany started the war.

*Stalin:* There was a difference in government but no difference in the economic systems. The government was a temporary factor.

*Stassen:* I do not agree. Yes, there was a difference of economic systems too. Imperialism, the development of state monopoly, and the oppression of workers are the evils of capitalism practiced by the Nazis. It seems to me we have been successful in America in preventing the monopoly of capitalism and the imperialistic trend, and that the workers have made greater progress through use of the strength of their vote and their freedom than Karl Marx or Frederick Engels thought they could make—and this regulation of free capital and prevention of monopoly and freedom of workers in America makes the economic situation quite different from that which existed in Germany.

*Stalin:* Let us not mutually criticize our systems. Everyone has the right to follow the system he wants to maintain. Which one is better will be said by history. We should respect the systems chosen by the people, and whether the system is good or bad is the business of the American people. To co-operate, one does not need the same systems. One should respect the other system when approved by the people. Only on this basis can we secure co-operation. Only, if we criticize, it will lead us too far.

As for Marx and Engels, they were unable to foresee what would happen forty years after their death. But we should adhere to mutual respect of people. Some people call the Soviet system totalitarian. Our people call the American system



monopoly capitalism. If we start calling each other names with the words monopolist and totalitarian, it will lead to no co-operation.

We must start from the historical fact that there are two systems approved by the people. Only on that basis is co-operation possible. If we distract each other with criticism, that is propaganda.

As to propaganda, I am not a propagandist but a business-like man. We should not be sectarian. When the people wish to change the systems they will do so. When we met with Roosevelt to discuss the questions of war, we did not call each other names. We established co-operation and succeeded in defeating the enemy.

*Stassen:* That sort of criticism has been a cause of misunderstanding after the war. Do you look forward in the future to a greater exchange of ideas and news, of students and teachers, of artists, of tourists, if there is co-operation?

*Stalin:* This will happen inevitably if co-operation is established. For an exchange of goods will lead to an exchange of people. . . .

*Stassen:* As I see it, then, you think it is possible that there will be co-operation provided there is a will and desire to co-operate.

*Stalin:* That is correct.

*Stassen:* In the development of the standards of living of the people, mechanization and electrification have been of major significance. The new development of atomic energy is of very great importance to all peoples of the world. I feel that the matter of international inspection, effective controls and outlawing the use for war of atomic energy is of supreme importance to all peoples of the world. Do you feel that there is a reasonable prospect of working out agreements for the long-term future for the peaceful development of atomic energy?

*Stalin:* I hope for this. There are big differences of views among us, but in the long run I hope we shall come to an understanding. International control and inspection will be established.

in my view, and it will be of great importance. The peaceful use of atomic energy will bring great technological changes. It is a very great matter. As for the use of atomic energy for war purposes, this in all probability will be prohibited. It will be a problem in the long run that will be met by the consciences of the people and it will be prohibited.

*Stassen:* Yes, that is one of our important problems and if solved it can be a great boon—and if not, a great curse to the people of the world.

*Stalin:* I think we shall succeed in establishing international inspection and control. Things are leading up to it.

*Stassen:* I appreciate the opportunity of talking with you.

*(The interview had now lasted forty minutes and Stassen prepared to take his leave. However, Stalin indicated a willingness to continue the discussion. The remainder of the conversation dealt with prevailing economic conditions in Europe and the United States.—Ed.)*

# BERLIN CRISIS, THE U.N. AND ANGLO-AMERICAN AGGRESSIVE POLICIES, CHURCHILL

*[Interview with correspondent of Pravda. October 28, 1948]*

*Question:* How do you regard the results of the discussions in the Security Council on the question of the situation in Berlin and the conduct of the Anglo-American and French representatives in this matter?

*Answer:* I regard them as a display of the aggressiveness of the policy of Anglo-American and French ruling circles.

*Question:* Is it true that in August of this year agreement had already been reached among the four powers on the question of Berlin?

*Answer:* Yes, that is true. Agreement is known to have been reached in Moscow on August 30 last, among the representatives of the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A., Great Britain, and France regarding the simultaneous implementation of measures for the lifting of transport restrictions, on the one hand, and for the introduction of the German mark of the Soviet zone in Berlin as the sole currency, on the other hand. That agreement does not hurt anyone's prestige. It takes into account the interests of the parties concerned and insures the possibility of further co-operation. But the governments of the U.S.A. and Great Britain disavowed their representatives in Moscow and declared the agreement to be null and void, that is, they violated the agreement, having decided to

refer the question to the Security Council where the Anglo-Americans have a guaranteed majority.

*Question:* Is it true that, in Paris during the recent discussions on the question in the Security Council, an agreement on the situation in Berlin had again been reached in unofficial talks even before the question was voted upon in the Security Council?

*Answer:* Yes. That is true. Dr. Bramuglia, the representative of the Argentine and president of the Security Council, who conducted unofficial talks with Comrade Vishinsky on behalf of the other powers concerned, did have in his hands an agreed-upon draft decision on the question of the situation in Berlin. But the representatives of the U.S.A. and Great Britain once again declared that agreement to be null and void.

*Question:* What is the matter then? Would you explain?

*Answer:* The thing is that those in the United States and Great Britain who inspire an aggressive policy do not consider themselves interested in an agreement and in co-operation with the U.S.S.R. What they want is not agreement and co-operation, but talk about agreement and co-operation, so as to put the blame on the U.S.S.R. by preventing agreement and thus to "prove" that co-operation with the U.S.S.R. is impossible. What the war instigators who are striving to unleash a new war fear most of all is the reaching of agreements and co-operation with the U.S.S.R. because a policy of concord with the U.S.S.R. undermines the position of the instigators of war and deprives the aggressive policy of these gentlemen of any purpose.

It is for this reason that they disrupt agreements that have already been reached, that they disavow their representatives who have drawn up such agreements together with the U.S.S.R., and in violation of the United Nations Charter refer the question to the Security Council, where they have a guaranteed majority and where they can "prove" whatever they like. All this is done to "show" that co-operation with the U.S.S.R. is impossible and to "show" the necessity for a new war, and thus to prepare the ground for the unleashing of war. The policy of the present



leaders of the U.S.A. and Great Britain is a policy of aggression, a policy of unleashing a new war.

*Question:* How should one regard the conduct of the representatives of the six states, members of the Security Council: of China, Canada, Belgium, Argentina, Colombia, and Syria?

*Answer:* Those gentlemen are obviously lending their support to the policy of aggression, to the policy of unleashing a new war.

*Question:* What can all this end in?

*Answer:* It can only end in ignominious failure on the part of the instigators of a new war. Churchill, the main instigator of a new war, has already managed to deprive himself of the trust of his own nation and of democratic forces throughout the world. The same fate lies in store for all other instigators of war. The horrors of the recent war are still too fresh in the memory of the peoples; and public forces favoring peace are too strong for Churchill's pupils in aggression to overpower them and to turn them toward a new war.

# BERLIN, DISARMAMENT, STALIN-TRUMAN MEETING

*[Interview with Kingsbury Smith, representative of International News Service, January 27, 1949]*

*Question:* Would the government of the U.S.S.R. be prepared to consider the issuance of a joint declaration with the government of the United States of America, asserting that the respective governments have no intention of resorting to war against one another?

*Answer:* The Soviet government would be prepared to consider the issuance of such a declaration.

*Question:* Would the government of the U.S.S.R. be prepared to join with the government of the United States of America in measures designed to implement this pact of peace, such as gradual disarmament?

*Answer:* Naturally, the government of the U.S.S.R. could cooperate with the government of the United States of America in taking measures designed to implement this pact of peace and leading to gradual disarmament.

*Question:* If the governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and France agreed to postpone the establishment of a separate Western German state, pending a meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers to consider the German problem as a whole, would the Government of the U.S.S.R. be prepared to remove the restrictions which the Soviet authorities have imposed on communications between Berlin and the Western zones of Germany?

*Answer:* Provided the United States of America, Great Britain, and France observe the conditions set forth in the third question, the Soviet government sees no obstacles to lifting transport restrictions, on the understanding, however, that transport and trade restrictions introduced by the three Powers should be lifted simultaneously.

*Question:* Would Your Excellency be prepared to confer with President Truman at a mutually suitable place to discuss the possibility of concluding such a pact of peace?

*Answer:* I have already stated before that there is no objection to a meeting.

*Kingsbury Smith later sent the following telegram to Stalin:*

The official representative of the White House, Charles Ross, stated today that President Truman would be glad to have the opportunity to confer with you in Washington. Would Your Excellency be prepared to go to Washington for this purpose?

If not, then where would you be prepared to meet the President?

*The reply was as follows:*

Your telegram of February 1 received. I am grateful to President Truman for the invitation to come to Washington. For a long time it has been my wish to visit Washington, and at one time I mentioned this to President Roosevelt at Yalta, and to President Truman at Potsdam.

Unfortunately, at present I am unable to realize this wish of mine, since doctors strongly object to my undertaking any prolonged journey, especially by sea or air.

The government of the Soviet Union would welcome the President's visit to the U.S.S.R. A conference could be arranged at the President's choice: in Moscow, Leningrad, Kaliningrad, Odessa, or at Yalta, provided, of course, this does not go against the President's consideration of convenience.

However, should this suggestion meet with objection, a meeting could be arranged, at the President's discretion, in Poland or Czechoslovakia.

# PEACE IN EUROPE

*[Greetings to the President and Prime Minister of the German Democratic Republic, October 13, 1949]*

Allow me to congratulate you and, in your persons, the German people, on the creation of the German Democratic Republic and the election of the former to the presidency and the latter as Prime Minister of the German Democratic Republic.

The formation of the peace-loving German Democratic Republic is a turning point in the history of Europe. There can be no doubt that the existence of a peace-loving democratic Germany side by side with the existence of the peace-loving Soviet Union excludes the possibility of new wars in Europe, puts an end to bloodshed in Europe, and makes impossible the enslaving of European countries by the world imperialists.

The experience of the recent war showed that the biggest sacrifices in this war were borne by the German and Soviet peoples, and that these two peoples possess the greatest potentialities in Europe for accomplishing great actions of world importance. If these two peoples display determination to fight for peace, straining their energies to the same extent as they did to wage war, peace in Europe may then be considered as secured.

Thus laying the foundation for a unified, democratic, and peace-loving Germany, you simultaneously perform a great deed for all of Europe, guaranteeing her lasting peace.

You need not doubt that in advancing along this road and promoting the cause of peace you will find great sympathy and active support among all the peoples of the world, including the American, British, French, Polish, Czechoslovak, and Italian peoples, let alone the peace-loving Soviet people. I wish you success on this new and glorious road. May unified, independent, democratic, peace-loving Germany live and prosper!



## PEACE IN KOREA

*[Reply to Prime Minister of India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, in connection with his proposals for seating the representatives of the People's Government of China on the Security Council of the U.N. and the "cessation of the conflict" in Korea, July 15, 1950]*

I welcome your peaceable initiative. I fully share your point of view as regards the expediency of peaceful regulation of the Korean question through the Security Council with the obligatory participation of representatives of the five great Powers, including the People's Government of China. I believe that for speedy settlement of the Korean question it would be expedient to hear in the Security Council representatives of the Korean people.

## PEACE IN THE FAR EAST

*[Greetings to Mao Tse-tung, Chairman of the Central People's Government, on the anniversary of the People's Republic of China, October 1, 1951]*

I am sending to the great Chinese people, to the Government of the People's Republic of China and to you personally hearty wishes for further successes in the building up of People's Democratic China.

May the great friendship of the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union, a friendship which is the firm guarantee of peace and security in the Far East, continue to become stronger!

# WHEN IS WAR NOT INEVITABLE?

*[Excerpts from an interview with correspondent of Pravda,  
February 16, 1951]*

*Question:* Do you consider a new world war inevitable?

*Answer:* No. At least at the present time it cannot be considered inevitable.

Of course, in the United States of America, in Britain, as also in France, there are aggressive forces thirsting for a new war. They need war to obtain super-profits, to plunder other countries. These are the billionaires and millionaires who regard war as an item of income which gives colossal profits.

They, these aggressive forces, control the reactionary governments and direct them. But at the same time they are afraid of their peoples who do not want a new war and stand for the maintenance of peace. Therefore they are trying to use the reactionary governments in order to enmesh their peoples with lies, to deceive them, and to depict the new war as defensive and the peaceful policy of the peace-loving countries as aggressive. They are trying to deceive their peoples in order to impose on them their aggressive plans and to draw them into a war.

Precisely for this reason they are afraid of the campaign in defense of peace, fearing that it can expose the aggressive intentions of the reactionary governments.

Precisely for this reason they turned down the proposal of the Soviet Union for the conclusion of a Peace Pact, for the reduction of armaments, for banning the atomic weapon, fearing

that the adoption of these proposals would undermine the aggressive measures of the reactionary governments and make the armaments race unnecessary.

What will be the end of this struggle between the aggressive and peace-loving forces?

Peace will be preserved and consolidated if the peoples will take the cause of preserving peace into their own hands and will defend it to the end. War may become inevitable if the war-mongers succeed in entangling the masses of the people in lies, in deceiving them and drawing them into a new world war.

That is why the wide campaign for the maintenance of peace as a means of exposing the criminal machinations of the war-mongers is now of first-rate importance.

As for the Soviet Union, it will continue in the future as well firmly to pursue the policy of averting war and maintaining peace.

# PROHIBITION OF ATOMIC WEAPONS

*Interview with correspondent of Pravda. October 6, 1951]*

*Question:* What is your opinion of the hubbub raised recently in the foreign press in connection with the test of an atom bomb in the Soviet Union?

*Answer:* Indeed, one of the types of atom bombs was recently tested in our country. Tests of atom bombs of different calibers will be conducted in the future as well, in accordance with the plan for the defense of our country from attack by the Anglo-American aggressive bloc.

*Question:* In connection with the test of the atom bomb, various personages in the United States are raising alarm and shouting about the threat to the security of the United States. Are there any grounds for such alarm?

*Answer:* There are no grounds whatever for such alarm. Personages in the United States cannot but know that the Soviet Union is not only opposed to the employment of the atomic weapon, but that it also stands for its prohibition and for the termination of its production. It is known that the Soviet Union has several times demanded the prohibition of the atomic weapon, but each time this has been refused by the Atlantic bloc powers. This means that, in the event of an attack by the United States on our country, the ruling circles of the United States will use the atom bomb. It is this circumstance that has compelled the Soviet Union to have the atomic weapon in order to meet the aggressors fully prepared. Of course the aggressors want the Soviet Union to be unarmed in the event of their attack



upon it. The Soviet Union, however, does not agree to this, and it thinks that it should be fully prepared to meet the aggressor. Consequently, if the United States has no intention of attacking the Soviet Union, the alarm of the personages in the United States should be considered as pointless and false, because the Soviet Union does not contemplate ever attacking the United States or any other country.

Personages in the United States are vexed because the secret of the atom bomb is possessed not only by the United States but also by other countries, the Soviet Union primarily. They would like the United States to be the monopolist of the production of the atom bomb. They would like the United States to have unlimited power to intimidate and blackmail other countries. But on what grounds do they think so? By what right do the interests of preserving peace require such monopoly? Would it not be more correct to say that matters are directly the opposite, that it is the interests of preserving peace that require first of all the liquidation of such a monopoly and then the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon too? I think that the proponents of the atom bomb may agree to the prohibition of the atomic weapon only if they see that they are no longer monopolists.

*Question:* What is your opinion regarding international control of the atomic weapon?

*Answer:* The Soviet Union stands for prohibiting the atomic weapon and terminating the production of the atomic weapon. The Soviet Union stands for the establishment of international control over the fully exact and conscientious implementation of the decision to prohibit the atomic weapon, to terminate the production of the atomic weapon and utilize the already produced atom bombs solely for civilian purposes. The Soviet Union stands for precisely this kind of international control. American personages also speak of control, but their control presupposes not the termination of the production of the atomic weapon, but the continuation of such production in quantities conforming

to the amounts of raw material at the disposal of different countries. Consequently, the American control presupposes not prohibiting the atomic weapon, but making it legal and lawful. Thereby the right of the warmongers to annihilate tens and hundreds of thousands of peaceful inhabitants with the help of the atomic weapon is made lawful. It is not difficult to understand that this is not control but a mockery of control and a deception of the peaceful aspirations of the peoples. It is clear that such control cannot satisfy the peace-loving peoples who demand the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the termination of its production.

## LAW IN DEFENSE OF PEACE

*[Enacted by the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., March 12, 1951]*

*In the preamble to the law the Supreme Soviet points to the sufferings of the peoples from "the calamities of two world wars in the course of one generation" and recognizes that the peoples "cannot reconcile themselves to the impunity with which war propaganda is being conducted by aggressive circles of some states." The following are the provisions of the law:*

"1. Propaganda for war, regardless of the form in which it is carried out, undermines the cause of peace, creates a threat of a new war and because of this constitutes the gravest crime against humanity.

"2. Persons guilty of propaganda for war shall be brought to trial and tried as heinous criminals."

## RECOMMENDED BOOKS

- THE U.S.S.R. AND WORLD PEACE** Andrei Y. Vyshinsky  
Six important speeches by the Soviet foreign minister before the U.N. and the Council of Foreign Ministers. Cloth, \$1.50; Paper, 75¢
- THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND THE COLD WAR** D. N. Pritt  
An eminent English lawyer comments on the U.S. State Department's attempts to distort the course of international events leading up to World War II. Cloth, \$1.25; Paper, 40¢
- AMERICAN IMPERIALISM** Victor Perlo  
How does American imperialism operate in its bid for world domination? A thoroughly documented study by a well-known economist. Trade, \$2.75; Pop., \$2.25
- THE NATURE OF SOVIET SOCIETY** P. F. Yudin  
A succinct study of the socialist economy, the prime sources of its development, and of the transition to communism. Paper, 20¢
- A SOVIET CITY AND ITS PEOPLE** Joseph Garelik  
A window into the daily life of an average Soviet industrial city and the people who live there. Cloth, \$1.25; Paper, 50¢
- PEOPLE COME FIRST** Jessica Smith  
The Soviet Union after the war described in richly human terms by the editor of "New World Review." Trade, \$2.75; Pop., \$2.50
- WORLD MONOPOLY AND PEACE** James S. Allen  
A stimulating book about the main economic forces which are shaping the world today. Trade, \$3.00; Pop., \$2.50

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS  
381 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 16, N. Y.