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On March 31 the Government of the Soviet Union sent through its Ambassadors the following memorandum on the North Atlantic Treaty to the Governments of the United States of America, Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxemburg and Canada:

On March 18 the State Department of the United States published the text of the North Atlantic Treaty which the Governments of the United States of America, Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxemburg and Canada intend to sign within the next few days.

The text of the North Atlantic Treaty fully confirms what was said in the declaration of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. of January 29 this year, which is being attached hereto, both as regards the aggressive aims of this Treaty and the fact that the North Atlantic Treaty contradicts the principles and aims of the United Nations Organisation and the commitments which the Governments of the United States of America, Great Britain and France have assumed under other Treaties and Agreements.

The statements contained in the North Atlantic Treaty, that it is designated for defence and that it recognises the principles of the United Nations Organisation, serve aims which have nothing in common either with the tasks of self-defence of the parties to the Treaty or with real recognition of the aims and principles of the United Nations Organisation.

Such great Powers as the United States, Great Britain and France are parties to the North Atlantic Treaty. Thus the Treaty is not directed either against the United States of America, Great Britain or France. Of the great Powers only the Soviet Union is excluded from among the parties to this Treaty, which can be explained only by the fact that this Treaty is directed against the Soviet Union. The fact that the North Atlantic Treaty is directed against the U.S.S.R. as well as against the countries of people's democracy was definitely pointed out.
also by official representatives of the United States of America, Great Britain and France.

To justify the conclusion of the North Atlantic Treaty, references are being made to the fact that the Soviet Union has defensive Treaties with the countries of people's democracy. These references, however, are utterly untenable.

All the Treaties of the Soviet Union on friendship and mutual assistance with the countries of people's democracy are of a bilateral nature, and they are directed solely against a possible repetition of German aggression, the danger of which not a single peace-loving State can forget. The possibility of interpreting them as Treaties which are in any degree aimed against the allies of the U.S.S.R. in the late war, against the United States or Great Britain or France, is absolutely precluded.

Moreover, the U.S.S.R. has similar Treaties against a repetition of German aggression not only with the countries of people's democracy, but also with Great Britain and France.

In contradistinction to this, the North Atlantic Treaty is not a bilateral, but a multilateral Treaty, which creates a closed grouping of States and, what is particularly important, absolutely ignores the possibility of a repetition of German aggression, consequently not having as its aim the prevention of a new German aggression. And inasmuch as of the great Powers which comprised the anti-Hitlerite coalition only the U.S.S.R. is not a party to this Treaty, the North Atlantic Treaty must be regarded as a Treaty directed against one of the chief allies of the United States, Great Britain and France in the late war, against the U.S.S.R.

Participants in the North Atlantic Treaty are effecting extensive military measures which can in no way be justified by the interests of self-defence of these countries. The extensive military measures carried out by the United States in co-operation with Great Britain and France under the present peace-time conditions, including the increase in all types of armed forces, the drafting of a plan for the utilisation of the atomic weapon, the stock-piling of atom bombs, which are purely an offensive weapon, the building of a network of air and naval bases, etc.—bear a by no means defensive character.

The preservation in Washington of the combined Anglo-American Staff organised during the Second World War, the recent establishment of the military staff of the so-called Western Union in Fontainebleau (France), as well as the intention immediately to set up the defence committee envisaged by the North Atlantic Treaty, are by no means an indication of the peace-loving or defensive aims of the participants of the Treaty,
but, together with other numerous military preparations, contribute to intensifying anxiety and alarm and to the whipping up of war hysteria in which all sorts of instigators of a new war are so interested.

The North Atlantic Treaty is designed to intimidate the States which do not agree to obey the dictate of the Anglo-American grouping of Powers that lay claim to world domination, though the bankruptcy of such claims was once again affirmed by the Second World War, which ended in the debacle of fascist Germany which also had laid claim to world domination.

Among the participants in the North Atlantic Treaty are also countries whose Governments expect to benefit at the expense of richer parties to the Treaty and make various plans with regard to obtaining new credits and other material advantages.

At the same time one cannot but see the groundlessness of the anti-Soviet motives of the North Atlantic Treaty, inasmuch as it is known to all that the Soviet Union does not intend to attack anyone and in no way threatens the United States of America, Great Britain, France or the other parties to the Treaty.

The conclusion of the North Atlantic Treaty and the establishment of the new grouping of Powers is motivated by the weakness of the United Nations Organisation. It is perfectly evident, however, that the North Atlantic Treaty does not serve the cause of strengthening the United Nations Organisation, but on the contrary leads to undermining the very foundations of this international organisation, because the establishment of the above grouping of Powers, far from corresponding to the aims and principles of the United Nations Organisation, runs counter to the Charter of this organisation.

The parties to the North Atlantic Treaty maintain that this Treaty allegedly represents a regional arrangement envisaged by Article 52 of the United Nations Charter. But such references are utterly groundless and untenable. There can be no question whatsoever of any regional character of this Treaty, inasmuch as the union provided for by this Treaty embraces States located in both hemispheres of the globe and it has not as its aims the settlement of any regional issues. This is also confirmed by the fact that, as has already been announced, States which are not members of the United Nations Organisation (Italy, Portugal) are being drawn into participation in the North Atlantic Treaty, whereas Article 52 of the United Nations Charter has in view the conclusion of regional arrangements only among members of the United Nations Organisation.

Nor can the establishment of the North Atlantic grouping
of States be justified by the right of each member of the United Nations to individual or collective self-defence in conformity with Article 51 of the Charter. Suffice it to say that such a right under the Charter of the United Nations can arise only in the case of armed attack against a member of the organisation, whereas, as is known to all, neither the United States of America, Britain, France nor the other parties to the Pact are threatened by any armed attack.

It is clear that the references to Articles 51 and 52 of the United Nations Charter are untenable and are designed merely to cover up the real aggressive aims of the military grouping of States which is being set up by the conclusion of the North Atlantic Treaty.

No one can deny that the North Atlantic Treaty, and first and foremost Article 5 of this Treaty, directly contradicts the Charter of the United Nations Organisation.

The text of Article 53 of the Charter, which speaks of enforcement actions under regional arrangements, states directly that “no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorisation of the Security Council”, with the exception of measures specially envisaged with regard to former enemy States. This notwithstanding, Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty envisages the employment of armed force by the parties to the Treaty without any authorisation of the Security Council.

Thus, even if the North Atlantic Treaty were to be considered as a regional arrangement, Article 5 of this Treaty is incompatible with the United Nations Charter. This shows once more how unfounded are all the references of the North Atlantic Treaty to recognition of the principles and aims of the Charter of the United Nations Organisation.

On the basis of all the above, the Soviet Government arrives at the following conclusions:

1. The North Atlantic Treaty has nothing in common with the aims of the self-defence of the States who are parties to the Treaty, who are threatened by no one, whom no one intends to attack. On the contrary, this Treaty has an obviously aggressive character and is aimed against the U.S.S.R., which fact is not concealed even by official representatives of the States who are parties to the Treaty in their public pronouncements.

2. The North Atlantic Treaty not only does not contribute to the consolidation of peace and international security, which is the duty of all members of the United Nations Organisation, but runs directly counter to the principles and aims of the United
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3. The North Atlantic Treaty runs counter to the Treaty between Great Britain and the Soviet Union signed in 1942, under which both States assumed the obligation to co-operate in the maintenance of peace and international security and “not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against the other High Contracting Party”.

4. The North Atlantic Treaty runs counter to the Treaty between France and the Soviet Union signed in 1944, under which both States assumed the obligation to co-operate in the maintenance of peace and international security and “not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against either of the High Contracting Parties”.

5. The North Atlantic Treaty runs counter to the agreements between the Soviet Union, the United States of America and Great Britain concluded at the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences, as well as at other conferences of the representatives of these Powers held both during and after the Second World War, under which the United States of America and Great Britain, like the Soviet Union, assumed the obligation to co-operate in the consolidation of general peace and international security and to contribute to the consolidation of the United Nations Organisation.
STATEMENT OF U.S.S.R. FOREIGN MINISTRY ON NORTH ATLANTIC PACT

ON JANUARY 14 the State Department of the United States of America published a lengthy statement under the resounding title: “Building 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,” concerning which the Government of the United States of America, together with Canada, has been conducting negotiations since last summer with the Governments of Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxemburg.

While last year 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 a 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, the officially proclaimed purpose of which is the desire to strengthen security in the North Atlantic area, would soon be submitted to the Senate for consideration.

1. WESTERN UNION—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 of the 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 outset precluded the possibility of the participation in that alliance of all the countries of people’s democracy and of the Soviet Union, and have thus disclosed that the
Western Union has not been formed with a view to uniting the peace-loving European countries, nor in the interests of assuring a durable peace in Europe generally, but with other ends in view which have nothing in common with concern for strengthening peace and international security.

It is not fortuitous that statesmen of the member countries of that group, beginning with the British Foreign Secretary, Bevin, have been obliged to declare openly that the establishment of the Western Union signifies an important change in the policy of these countries—which could not be concealed when the backstage preparations of that group had been 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 aimed at consolidating the forces of all peace-loving States in order to do away with Hitler aggression and fascism and to prevent a 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 win victory in the war of liberation against Hitler Germany and fascism. They were also united by the will to prevent, in future as well, the German aggression that has unleashed two world wars within the past decades.

Those 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 a resurgence of 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 peace-loving nations of Europe.

The Soviet Union, now as before, strictly abides by this policy—a policy in full conformity with the decisions of the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences of the heads of the Governments of the U.S.S.R., the United States, Great Britain, and of France, which endorsed these decisions, a policy directed towards ensuring a durable peace in Europe and preventing fresh aggres-
sion 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, highly dan­
gerous for the peace-loving nations, with the purpose of estab­
lishing their domination over other nations of Europe, not
stopping at employing for these ends yesterday's aggressor, who
has since the termination of the war become dependent on them.

Nothing else could explain why, though the Brussels Pact
ments in passing a desire to prevent a resurgence of an
aggressive policy on Germany's part, the Governments of Great
Britain and France at the present time, together with the
Government of the United States, strive to enlist and utilise
for their ends Western Germany, where old pro-Nazi and mili­
taristic elements of German reaction are more and more deeply
entrenching themselves in all sections of the administrative
machinery—with the help in the first place of the Anglo­
American occupation authorities.

The fact that this turn in 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 treaties of mutual assistance concluded
by the Soviet Union with other European States, including
Britain and France—treaties which are 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 Ger­
many as with a view to employing the group of Western Powers
they have formed against 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 U.S.S.R. and the States
of people's democracy, notwithstanding the fact that the peace­
ful policies of these countries are an indisputable and univer­
sally known fact. It is indisputable, then, that no matter how
hard they may try to conceal the true aims of the Brussels
Treaty, the establishment of the Western Union has nothing in
common with concern for the defence of these States.

Furthermore it has by now been made sufficiently clear that
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 liberation movement 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 newly 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 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 anything but concerned with the attainment of the genuine national-State or, at least, economic goals of any of 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 a genuine economic revival of the European States, but serves as a means of adjusting the policy and economy of the "Marshallised" 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 a view to 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 a view to bolstering up and further expanding the domineering influence of the Anglo-American ruling circles, in Europe, and to subjugating to their narrow interests the external and internal policies of the respective European States.

The incompatibility of such political plans of the Anglo-American bloc with concern for peace and with the realisation 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 nowhere 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.
It is now clear to all that the faster and farther the countries of the Western Union progress along the path of opposing the countries of people's democracy and the Soviet Union—a path to which they are being persistently pushed by the policy of the Anglo-American bloc—the more the West European Powers will become politically and economically dependent on the ruling circles of the United States, who are not in the least concerned about the political independence and economic rebirth of the European states.

As a result—inevitable and already observed at every turn—will come an intensification of the contradictions both between the United States and the countries of the Western bloc, and amongst the West European grouping itself.

It is on neither a sound nor a firm basis of economic rebirth that the new West European grouping has been set—a grouping which is of auxiliary significance in a way, if one bears in mind the broader European grouping set up from among the "Marshallised" countries. Far from rendering the countries participating in the new grouping any substantial practical aid, this grouping has in no way prevented the appearance of mounting economic difficulties in many West European States, nor has it prevented a tremendous growth of unemployment in some of them, and it has not helped to open hopeful prospects for their further economic progress.

The aggressive purposes of this grouping are further reflected in the ever-increasing demands for greater armies and military expenditures, and this increasingly undermines their chances for further and stable economic advance. At the same time this situation leads to an intensification of grave political difficulties inside these States. And this at a time when the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy, which are taking only 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.

By now the Western Union has launched quite a number of measures for giving itself structural shape. As far back as last spring, following the formation of the Consultative Council, a standing body of that Union comprising representatives of the five States was set up in London. They have likewise set up a Military Committee, and even a Western Union Defence Staff comprising the Chiefs of Staff of the five States headed by the British Field Marshal Montgomery, 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 organisational measures, including the institution of the Military
Staff, in the conditions of the present peaceful situation, in no way testifies to a desire of the participants in the new grouping to ensure a durable peace in Europe. The hasty manner of carrying through all these measures rather shows that they pursue the aim of bringing political pressure to bear on certain European countries, including the Western part of Germany, and by means of this publicity hullabaloo around all these measures, to speed up the enlistment of these countries into the Western group 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 group 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 U.S.A. The aims of the North Atlantic Alliance are much more far-reaching than those of the West European grouping, and it is quite easy to see that these aims are very closely interwoven with 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 link, and not the main one, in the system of measures contained in the plans for establishing Anglo-American world domination. While giving Great Britain the chief place in the Western Union, leading circles of the United States have every possibility of influencing in 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 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 realisation of the Western Union in Europe and the 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 groupings of the countries already created in Europe and in America be-
coming 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 had prepared, as a regional agreement on matters of security among the countries of the Northern Atlantic, thereby casting a veil over the true nature and real significance 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 an endeavour to conceal still more deeply 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 "obstruction" in the United Nations and to deliberately nebulous statements about the need "to meet a potential aggressor with overwhelming force," this allegedly being the duty of the special grouping of countries, with the United States at its head, which cannot wait until the United Nations Organisation will have become 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 countries of people's democracy, and it 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, in the eyes of world public opinion, recoils ever more frequently against those who resort to such mean methods of political struggle. The draft of the North Atlantic Pact 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 in it, as its nucleus, of the five European countries, Canada and the United States, it is, however, clear to all that the 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 post-war task of the United States and
Great Britain in Churchill’s sensational speech in Fulton, delivered at an unusual gathering which took place under President Truman’s chairmanship.

Apart from the United States, Canada and the five West European countries, with such a “North Atlantic” State as Luxembourg included among them, the draft of the North Atlantic Treaty provides for the inclusion in it 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, and refer to the peculiar activity displayed in this affair by the Government of Norway.* Some quarters suggest circumventing difficulties in this respect by instituting a special Scandinavian pact, which should not—according to these plans—prevent the Scandinavian countries from being brought into the orbit of the States actually 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, and in doing so they evidently believe that this method will help in solving the tasks of the leading grouping of the so-called “Northern Atlantic.”

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 testified to by the project for establishing a grouping of the countries of South Eastern Asia, the practical implementation of which project 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 for the peoples of Asia to consent to embark on the slippery path on to 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, the greatest possible number of States and thus to take them in hand. With

* See Supplement
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 countries which,
however, under pressure of the “dollar policy,” are getting in-
creasingly involved in fresh economic difficulties. They scare
them with the non-existent menace of a “potential aggressor”
and at the same time resort to gross means of pressure on the
Governments of 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 participa-
tion in that Pact of all the countries of people’s democracy and
of the Soviet Union, having given it to be understood that these
States cannot become a party to the Treaty and, moreover, that
the North Atlantic Pact is levelled precisely against the U.S.S.R.
and the countries of new democracy.

It is seen from all the above that the aims of the North
Atlantic Pact consist in the ruling circles of the United States
and Great Britain holding the reins in regard to the greatest
possible number of States, depriving them of the possibility
of pursuing an independent, national foreign and international
policy, and 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 U.S.S.R. and of
the countries of new democracy 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 men thought that in the
post-war period they would succeed, by means of pressure and
threats of every sort, in pushing the Soviet Union off the socialist
road which it has 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 its domes-
tic difficulties and would be bound to abandon its socialist posi-
tion 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 existence of shortsighted calcu-
lations of every kind and of plans hostile to our Soviet Mother-
land. 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
policies.” This was said by the State Department evidently in
order to justify the present plans for the North Atlantic Alli-
ance, 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 above that in point of fact the North Atlantic Pact represents the most far-reaching 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 would like, in one way or another, to adjust to these ends the policy of the Governments of other States that are 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 like the pacts of the Mediterranean States, the Scandinavian countries, the countries of South-Eastern Asia, etc., which are now being engineered, are closely bound up with the aims of the North Atlantic Pact, which serves as a guiding line in the 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 that one's hands can reach.

One cannot help realising, however, that it is one thing to construct all sorts of groupings and to be collecting signatures to more and more pacts, cooked up in the chancelleries of the American State Department and British Foreign Office, and an entirely different thing, of course, really to 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 the friction actually existing 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 the two powers clash with each other at every turn. The less possible it is then to reconcile, by signing various pacts, the conflicting interests of the big and small countries participating in these groups, 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 groups, and not all of the 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 straightening their backs and standing erect?

Lastly, we must speak of the Soviet Union and the countries
of people's democracy, 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 other countries, is an insuperable obstacle to all and every plan for establishing the world domination of any Powers. This has found its historical confirmation in the liquidation of the Fascist States, which endeavoured to carry through their fantastic plans of world domination, plans from which the present plans for establishing Anglo-American domination differ very little.

In view of all the above, 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, are so apt to be carried away by dreams of unprecedented expansion of their armies, of the tremendous increase of their military budgets, of the further building of their network of air and naval bases in all parts of the globe, and by dreams of all sorts of other military plans, including monstrous plans for 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 all sections of the public in Europe and America, depicting the unprecedented growth of democratic forces and of the national liberation movement in the post-war 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 war propaganda has been unanimously condemned by the United Nations; they increasingly incite their placemen and the press dependent on them against such peace-loving countries as the Soviet Union and the States of people's democracy and spread floods of lies and bellicose threats. They need all this, because all too often they dare not undertake any real solution of the domestic problems that have matured in their own countries in keeping with the new historical situation.

That is why they build their calculations for the future preeminently on these or other aggressive plans, even though they do understand that these are unrealisable except by violence, except by unleashing a new war.

The ruling circles of the United States, immediately after the termination of the Second World War, began establishing air and naval bases in both the Atlantic and in the Pacific, as well as on many remote seas, including areas located thousands and thousands of miles from the United States' boundaries. Since that time the number of American war bases, far from being reduced, has been considerably multiplied, both in the Eastern
and in the Western hemispheres, in the countries of Europe and in the countries of America, Asia and Africa.

Entire States, especially from among those situated close to the boundaries of the U.S.S.R., have been adjusted to provide convenient bridgeheads for the Anglo-American air forces and other conveniences for attacking the U.S.S.R. The flow of various arms is being directed to such States by means of ever new American credits granted to 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 after the Second World War which ended in the defeat of the aggressive powers.

Furthermore, can it be considered accidental that after the termination of the Second World War the United States and Great Britain have preserved their organisation of the combined Chiefs of Staff in Washington, which in a hush-hush manner continues its work, preparing its fresh plans of aggression? For if no such plans existed there would be no reason for preserving that Staff in Washington under present peace-time 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 not only stationed in the countries of Europe and Asia for the purpose of carrying out their post-war occupation tasks on former enemy territories. American troops still remain on the territories of a whole number of States which are members of the United Nations.

It has become the custom in recent years with the ruling circles of the United States to assume the right to send their troops to the 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 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 recognised that certain circles in the United States are seeking to prepare both Western Germany and Japan as their weapons for the implementation of 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 the peace treaties both with Germany and with Japan. This is the natural consequence of the foreign policy of the ruling circles of the United States, a policy which is based at the present time on aggressive plans and is not aimed at strengthening universal peace.

The aggressive nature of United States policy in regard to the
growing democratic forces and entire democratic countries is common knowledge. To this day the Greek people has been unable to get out of its present impasse, because reactionary forces alien to the people find powerful support from outside.

No sooner had the peoples of Czechoslovakia last year curbed somewhat 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 clamour about the internal developments in Czechoslovakia, and various attempts were made to interfere with these domestic affairs.

In their relations with the Soviet Union, the ruling circles of the United States and of other countries of the Anglo-American bloc more and more vividly demonstrate their unwillingness to reckon with the agreements that only recently were unanimously accepted as the basis for carrying out the joint policy of the U.S.S.R., the United States and Great Britain in the post-war period.

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 Britain do not consider themselves interested in agreement and co-operation with the U.S.S.R. Even when they speak about this, it all reduces to talk about agreement and co-operation, and ends in a plain renunciation of former agreements and in direct sabotage of any real co-operation with the U.S.S.R.

Things have gone so far that, in the field of trade with the Soviet Union, the United States is pursuing 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 U.S.S.R.,” although such a policy damages first and foremost the prestige of the country that inspires it.

All the above facts relating to the post-war foreign policy of the United States and Great Britain are evidence that at the present time the ruling circles of these Powers, far from pursuing a policy of establishing a lasting and universal peace, have, on the contrary, embarked on a policy which cannot be described otherwise than as a policy of aggression, a policy of unleashing another war. The North Atlantic Pact, which conforms to the plans for the establishment by violence 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 British inspirers of the Pact as Churchill and Bevin, but a good many other warmongers of lesser calibre that stand in the background of this Pact.

One should bear in mind, however, that the signing of these
or any similar pacts does not serve as a guarantee, nor yet provide an opportunity for the realisation of the aggressive aims set by the inspirers of such pacts.

One should recall in this connection the unanimous support given in democratic circles of all countries to the well-known statement of the head of the Soviet Government, J. V. Stalin, that "the horrors of the recent war are too alive in the minds of the people, and the social forces in favour of peace are too great for Churchill's pupils in aggression to be able to overpower and deflect them towards a new war."

III. THE NORTH ATLANTIC ALLIANCE—A FACTOR UNDERMINING THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANISATION

THE State Department's official statement attempts to establish that the grounds for the formation of the North Atlantic Alliance, as also of the other groupings mentioned above, are a striving to "strengthen the United Nations Organisation." Such a statement would be convincing only if it were possible to 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 Organisation could serve to strengthen this organisation. Such an assumption, however, it stands to reason, is utterly absurd.

In actual fact, the knocking together of the North Atlantic Alliance, heading a whole series of specific groupings of States in various parts of the globe, represents the final breaking away of the present policy of the United States and Great Britain from the 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 Organisation was being created and its Charter drawn up and endorsed.

It is a well known fact that the United Nations Organisation did not discuss the formation of the North Atlantic Alliance, or of the Western Union, or of the Pan-American Pact. It is equally known that the question of the formation of a Mediterranean Union, or a Scandinavian grouping, or an alliance of countries of South-East Asia and other alliances of States in the process of organisation, is at present proceeding without the participation of the United Nations Organisation and in outright circumvention of this organisation. The participants of these groups and, first of all, the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain, realise that it is not to their advantage to bring these questions up for discussion by the United Nations. Here they would probably be asked what were the real purposes and nature of these groups. This is in no way desired by the Governments concerned, which are directing the formation of all these alliances, blocs and groupings. They
prefer to do this secretly, behind the back of the United Nations Organisation.

The ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain are actually facing the United Nations Organisation with a fait accompli by forming these blocs and groupings. All this, however, does not prevent them from all the while claiming that the North Atlantic Alliance, as well as the other blocs and groupings that they are forming, serve to strengthen the United Nations Organisation. However, no one now believes these words. Even those who make such statements do not attribute any significance to these words.

In actual fact the North Atlantic Alliance and its associated groupings of States, headed by the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain, constitute a direct undermining of the United Nations Organisation. Today these groupings aim at undermining the authority of the United Nations Organisation, tomorrow they may bring about the destruction of this organisation.

Not for nothing have the foundations of this organisation been systematically undermined in the last three years, which is especially reflected in the effort to do away with the principle of Five-Power unanimity in settling all the major issues ensuring universal peace and international security, as laid down in the Charter.

In support of the position 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 exceptional 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 Organisation.

It goes without saying that this 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 associated arrangements has nothing in common whatever 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 various 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 claimed in mockery that the North Atlantic Pact is a regional arrangement. He who respects Article 52 of the United Nations Charter will not take this view, as the North Atlantic Alliance was formed, not on the basis of Article 52, but as a direct violation of the Charter and the fundamental principles of the United Nations Organisation.

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 United Nations,” and the Security Council is as yet unable to take due measures to maintain world peace. The fact that such an Article is necessary in the United Nations Charter is very 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, nor Great Britain, nor any other of the countries of the Northern Atlantic, are menaced by any armed attack whatever. This alone suffices to prove the groundlessness of any references to Article 51 which aim at justifying 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 the 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 forcibly to establish the domination of the United States and Great Britain over other countries, if there did not exist the striving to establish by force Anglo-American world domination.

The North Atlantic Pact is by no means required for self-defence, but for realisation of the policy of aggression, for effecting 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 wide public, but cannot serve to explain the real motives for the formation of this new “North Atlantic” grouping and all kinds of associated subsidiary unions and blocs. This is how matters stand with the State Department’s references to Articles 51 and 52 of the United Nations Charter.

If admittedly the State Department’s references to the United Nations Charter are irrelevant, then it becomes necessary to refer to another 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’s reference to the Vandenberg resolution, adopted by the American Senate, are deserving of especial attention.

Last summer the United States Senate approved a resolution
submitted by Vandenberg on the “new departure” in American foreign policy. The State Department’s statement says that the afore-mentioned “resolution proposes that for the first time in the nation’s history the United States associates itself in peacetime with countries outside the Western hemisphere in collective security arrangements designed to safeguard peace and to strengthen our security”.

This statement of the State Department once again refutes its own assertion that the North Atlantic grouping is of a regional nature. It at the same time demonstrates that, since the end of the Second World War, changes have occurred in the foreign policy pursued by the ruling circles of the United States which lay bare the present frankly aggressive nature of this policy. This resolution gives a free hand to the United States Government to set up any international alliance in peacetime and, on the pretext of ensuring security, permits 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.

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 Organisation, but that they have also taken a new course in their foreign policy, which will be aimed hereafter at establishment by force of Anglo-American world domination. It follows from this, that the resolution adopted by the American Senate signifies that 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 world-wide peace and are waging a tireless struggle against all the 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 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 at every step trampled on 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 take into account the agreements signed by them. In violation of the letter and spirit of former agreements, the ruling circles of
the United States and Great Britain are now forming the so-called “North Atlantic Alliance,” not only without the participation of the U.S.S.R. but even with the direct aim of using this grouping against the U.S.S.R. and the people’s democracies.

The Soviet Union is also a party to the 20-year Treaties of Friendship and Mutual Assistance with Great Britain and France which fully meet the interests of universal lasting 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 to support and consolidate peace in Europe jointly with the Soviet Union which Great Britain and France had assumed. The Governments of Great Britain and France are taking part in setting up the 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 participation of the U.S.S.R. but even with the direct aim of utilising 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 prepared the setting up of the United Nations Organisation. 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 Organisation and therefore the principle of the unanimity of the five great Powers in settling major issues of peace and international security was taken as the basis of the United Nations Charter.

Almost on the day following the establishment of the United Nations Organisation, the undermining of the latter began. Although this was effected by other hands everyone saw and knew that the undermining work was directed by the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain.

What was this due to?

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 it was precisely they who must play the leading role in the United Nations Organisation and not all the five great Powers jointly.

However, inasmuch as the Soviet Union demanded and demands strict adherence to the provision of the United Nations Charter on the necessity of concerted actions on the part of all five great Powers, since only such concordant actions can actually guarantee universal peace and international security, the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain intensified their attacks on the U.S.S.R. and developed even more extensive activity with a view to undermining the United Nations Organisation. However, all this proved insufficient.

Inasmuch as the Soviet Union and a number of other States
do not agree to 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 Organisation 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 U.S.S.R. for its defence of the very principles on which the United Nations Organisation was established, since they could in no way shake the position of the Soviet Government which is defending the sacred cause of the consolidation of universal lasting peace and is 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 circumvent the United Nations Organisation. It was this policy that resulted in the establishment of the North Atlantic Alliance as well as the other groupings of Powers which have been and are being set up secretly behind the back of the United Nations Organisation. Thus we have every ground for asserting that the North Atlantic Alliance is a factor undermining the United Nations Organisation.

One cannot ignore the fact that this reflects the persistent endeavour of the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain to bring about the utter disintegration and collapse of the United Nations Organisation, which somewhat curbs them and prevents other States being involved in their aggressive policy, and which cannot become a dumb tool in the hands of the Anglo-American bloc in the implementation of their policy which is aimed at forcibly establishing Anglo-American world domination.

After this it is 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 U.S.S.R. 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 their reverting to the old anti-Soviet course of foreign policy based on the isolation of the U.S.S.R., which they followed in the years preceding the Second World War and which almost led to the complete destruction of European civilisation.

Carried away by their aggressive plans for world domination, the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain have failed to understand that the so-called "new departure" of their policy, running counter to their recent obligations towards the U.S.S.R. and other members of the United Nations, far from
being able to increase the consolidation of their political and economic positions, will be condemned by all peace-loving nations, will be condemned by all the champions of the consolidation of universal peace, who constitute the overwhelming majority in all countries.

**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 by force Anglo-American domination over the world, 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 more consistent struggle against each and every warmonger, against the policy of aggression and unleashing of a new war, for a world-wide, lasting, 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 who voice the genuine sentiments and aspirations of the peoples who bore on their shoulders the unbelievable burden 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 Organisation is now being undermined, since this organisation, at least to a certain extent, hampers and curbs the aggressive circles in their policy of aggression and unleashing of 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 Organisation by aggressive elements and their accomplices, and must see to it that the United Nations Organisation does not connive with such elements as is often the case now, that it values its authority more highly when the matter consists in giving a rebuff to those pursuing a policy of aggression and unleashing of a new war.
J. V. STALIN’S REPLIES TO FOUR QUESTIONS

The following are the answers given by J. V. Stalin to questions put by Mr. Kingsbury Smith, European General Manager, International News Service of America, received on January 27, 1949:

First 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.

Second 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 co-operate with the Government of the United States of America in taking measures designed to implement this pact of peace and leading to gradual disarmament.

Third 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.

Fourth 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.

Your telegram of February 1 received.

I am grateful to President Truman for the invitation to come to Washington. For a long time it was 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 realise this wish of mine, since the 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. The conference could be arranged at the President's choice either in Moscow or in Leningrad or in Kaliningrad, in Odessa or at Yalta, provided, of course, that this does not go against the President's considerations of convenience.

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

Respectfully,

J. STALIN.

February 2, 1949
In connection with reports that have appeared in the press regarding Norway's intention to join the Atlantic Alliance, the Soviet Government has authorised me to make the following statement.

According to numerous available data, a so-called Atlantic Alliance will shortly be established. Although the initiators of this alliance declare that the Atlantic Alliance pursues defensive aims, the Soviet Government possesses sufficient grounds for asserting that the Atlantic Alliance now in process of preparation cannot serve to strengthen universal peace, but on the contrary represents a group of powers pursuing aggressive aims, as is also confirmed by the fact that the Atlantic Alliance is being set up outside of and by-passing the United Nations.

There are also sufficient grounds to assert that the initiators of the Atlantic Pact are trying to utilise the establishment of this new international grouping in order to set up air and naval bases in various parts of the globe, and particularly on the territory of Powers situated close to the frontiers of the Soviet Union, a situation that does not at all testify to peaceful aims on the part of this grouping.

In calling the attention of the Norwegian Government to this state of affairs, the Soviet Government deems it necessary to state that it regards the Atlantic Alliance as a grouping of Powers of the sort which in fact is being counterposed to the United Nations Organisation and pursues aims possessing nothing in common with the interests of consolidating peace.

In view of all that has been said above, the Soviet Government requests the Government of Norway to explain the stand of the Norwegian Government regarding the Atlantic Pact, particularly having in mind the circumstance that Norway has a common frontier with the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Government asks to be informed whether the reports that have appeared in the press to the effect that Norway is joining the Atlantic Alliance correspond to reality, and also to be informed whether the Norwegian Government is undertaking any obligations to the Atlantic Alliance regarding the establishment of air or naval bases on Norwegian territory.

Hr. Schilstad promised to bring this statement to the notice of the Norwegian Government.
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