



Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

MS-4787: Abba Hillel Silver Papers, 1902-1989.

Series IV: Sermons, 1914-1963, undated.

Reel
166

Box
60

Folder
976

Communist salesmen in democratic lands, 1956.

COMMUNIST SALESMEN IN DEMOCRATIC LANDS

April 29, 1956

Ever since the death of Stalin, some three years ago, the rulers of the Soviet Union have been engaged in a campaign to make friends in the Democratic world.

In the days of Stalin the rulers of Russia were engaged in a campaign to subvert the Democratic world.

And this, in my judgement -- what has been taking place in the last few years, -- represents a fundamental change. And even if one maintains that it is only a change in tactics and method, and does not represent a change in ultimate objectives, it is still an important and significant change. For tactics and methods have a way of integrating themselves in ultimate objectives and therefore have an intrinsic value of their own. And sometimes tactics are more important than ultimate objectives, which are really seldom attained. Means and methods have a way of determining the fabric of the ultimate outcome -- of affecting the final results. Even if that which has taken place recently in the Soviet Union represents only a change in method, an approach, that too is tremendously significant.

Bulganin and Khrushchev, in visiting India, Burma and Afghanistan and more recently Great Britain, were not out to Communize or Sovietize these countries. Or in some subtle and conspiratorial manner to undermine their institutions and their accustomed way of life. They are really not as naive as all that. They were out to make friends for Russia. To create new markets for Russian trade and to end a long period of isolation which its own threatening, revolutionary ideology and its own technique of subversion had imposed upon the Soviet Union. It is true that they had previously talked about the possibility of co-existence between capitalism and communism, but only by way of an argument when hard-pressed by way of a formal reassurance of the western world in a certain specific emergency. But

now they are in dead earnest about it. They want this co-existence badly and they are making a supreme effort to insure it. Not so much as a means to something else, but as an end in itself - something which is urgently needed, desperately wanted, by the peoples of the Soviet Union.

And so earnest and urgent are they about it that they have done many things in the last few years which were unthinkable prior to that time. They ate humble pie with Tito, if you will remember, and called upon him whom they had expelled from their circle and had denounced as a traitor and as an enemy. They called upon him on a mission of reconciliation and they humbly acknowledged their mistake and solicited that reconciliation. More recently they abolished and made public announcement of the abolition of the Cominform - this international Communist organization which had expelled Tito - and through which Communist Russia had channeled much of its international propaganda and subversive activity. But much more astonishing than all this has been the systematic campaign which has been going on in the Soviet Union for some time now, to discredit the old Stalinist Regime. To down-grade -- in fact to liquidate -- Stalin himself. He who had been enthroned on high for nearly a generation - the myth of the genius of Stalin which had been so systematically cultivated in the Union - which was part of the education of every child in the school system of the Union -- Stalin as the true heir of Lenin - Stalin as the great economist and theoretician - Stalin as the glorious war leader -- all that myth is today almost a heresy in the Soviet Union. Three years after his death, Stalin is being systematically assassinated.

And the present rulers of Russia are publicly beating their breasts in acknowledging, not only the errors of the past regime - under which they lived and thrived, and with which they cooperated most closely -- but they are acknowledging without shame and without hesitancy - the criminal acts of the past generation in the Soviet Union. The unbridled tyranny and terrorism, the miscarriage of justice, the wholesale purges of innocent people, the very crimes with which the free world

charged the Soviet Union in the last generation, but which charges and accusations were contemptuously rejected and denied.

At the 20th Communist part Congress last February Khrushchev himself acknowledged all these crimes of the Communist regime.

What a vindication all this is for Democracy! And what a vindication of those contentions of the free world - coming out of the mouth of the arch-communist himself! Not outside of Russia - but inside of Russia. How self-accused and self-condemned are these communists today, not only in the Soviet Union but all their adherents and defenders and apologists, outside.

For while these Bulganins and Khrushchevs are denouncing the one-man tyranny of Stalin, with which they collaborated, for the crimes which they witnessed with their own eyes but raised no voice of protest against them - they are also, in the same breath really denouncing and repudiating themselves. For what do they suggest as a substitute for the one-man tyranny of Stalin. They have now established a collective tyranny of a half-dozen or a dozen men. A tyranny no less thorough going - no less oppressive of basic human rights and freedoms and no less capable of criminal oppression and criminal abuse than the one-man tyranny of Stalin. This-new

This new dictatorial Junta - this plural-headed Hydra of ^{aris} ~~ant~~ocracy - is now offering the Russian people no freedom of thought or freedom of speech or freedom of assembly - no right of any opposition political party to exist - they are offering the people nothing which we associate with the democratic way of life. They are offering them the delusion of the benefit of a multiple, collective dictatorship in place of a unitary dictatorship. Still a self-sufficient, and to itself exclusively accountable tyranny -- the tyranny of an oligarchy -- in place of the sole and absolute tyranny of one man - Stalin.

Nevertheless I believe that the world will welcome this change. Only as it is important -- only as it points the way to the next step -- and in my humble judgment inevitably so. The collapse - the ultimate collapse - of this collective dictatorship

in some unforeseen crisis of the future which will usher in the next stage of development in the Soviet Union -- which will usher in the era when the Russian people will finally rise up and demand as other peoples have demanded, the rights of free men, and a charter of human liberties. This is bound to come. And the first decisive step has been taken -- not voluntarily -- and perhaps not knowingly of the ultimate consequences -- the first step has now been taken.

As to the reason for this radical and startling change opinions may differ. The best informed opinion seems to be that with the death of Stalin the circle about him, from which circle his successor had to come, thought it best for themselves, if not for the country, that no single dictator with absolute power should be permitted. In a way it was a way of insuring their own survival for a competition of leadership for the sole exclusive, absolute power might have lead to strife and to liquidations with which the Russian rulers are very familiar. No single dictator but on the other hand no reduction, no limitation of dictatorship in Russia and therefore a collective dictatorship and therefore the principal of the one-man dictator, with which the Russian people had been habituated and to which they had been educated had to be discredited, and therefore the whole Stalin legend, --Stalin who represented the incorporation of the idea of the one-man ruler -- the whole legend of Stalin had to be dismantled -- had to be destroyed. And so the vast Russian propaganda machine which reaches every town and factory and village and home in the Union was put into full operation. The leaders of Russia know exactly how to manipulate this machine. And how a hero can, almost overnight, become a villain. They have done that time and again. They have done that with the leaders of the Revolution who were liquidated by Stalin and had bullets sent into their heads. They know exactly how one's character can be assassinated and destroyed. The Stalin legend therefore is being liquidated. And the authority of the Communist Party as such is being reasserted and reestablished. That authority which it enjoyed under Lenin and the executive power of this party will now be lodged in a group which will share collective responsibility.

The new rulers of Russia now feel that the isolation which Stalin had forced upon Russia is no longer necessary or desirable. They feel that they can best serve the interests of Russia - no longer by a program by a program of conspiratorial subversion all over the world, or military threats, which really frighten the free world and force the free world to organize itself against the Soviet Union - they are now proceeding to employ the methods which are used in the free world -- the methods of diplomacy, of friendly contacts between governments and between peoples. They resolved to win friends for themselves or keep the neutral, non-committed countries from joining alliances against Russia, by extending economic aid to those countries, which Russia is now in position to do, and even if necessary military aid. They feel that the position of Russia today, ~~is an~~^{the} economic position, makes increasing trade with the free world obligatory - imperative. The present rulers of Russia are also less afraid of the free world than was Stalin. They are possessed now of the A-Bomb and the H-Bomb, and in regard to other military matters of strength they feel that they are the equal of countries like the United States. They feel that a war between the East and the West is neither imminent nor likely in the proximate future, or at all, and therefore they are moving out more confidently on the international scene. There must be also grave internal pressure within the Soviet Union which makes^a fuller contact with the rest of the world vitally necessary.

Now as they do^{that which} ~~what~~ they have set out to do quite deliberately and energetically, they will, I believe, increasingly come to realize the possibilities as well as the limits of their efforts. And the limits of their diplomatic victories. They will come to understand the extent to which either belligerency or cajolary can really go, in the free world. Now Bulganin and Khrushchev received a wild and tumultuous welcome in India. India is not a long established democracy. The people of India are still smarting under the memories of colonial exploitation on the part of western powers, especially of Great Britain. India, in the present struggle between the East and the West, adopted a policy of what they call positive neutralism, and India

has sort of been cultivating the good will of the Soviet Union. And the reception arranged for Bulganin and Khrushchev in India was fostered by the government and perhaps organized by the government. It was a different story altogether when Bulganin and Khrushchev visited an old, tried, hard-headed democracy like Britain the mother of Parliament. There the reception was not quite as enthusiastic and tumultuous. There the people were far more critical of their invited guests. Free and organized labor, ^{in England} for example, was not swept off its feet by the blandishments of the Communist emissaries, for they know from a long experience in trade unionism what had taken place in the Soviet Union. They know that Communism ~~and-shackled~~ enshackles labor and does not enfranchise it. And the common people of Great Britain were courteous to their invited guests but distinctly reserved and were in a mood of critical appraisal of the representatives of the Soviet Union. And Bulganin and Khrushchev did not fail at all to appreciate the significance of all that.

The results of the meeting between these leaders and the leaders of Great Britain were limited in scope. The great issues were not decided - some of them were not even touched upon. The question of the re-unification of Germany did not come up. The question of peace and security in Europe was touched upon but as the joint communique which was issued stated, an understanding on the means to achieve that end was not reached. Nevertheless the meeting between the leaders of Great Britain and the Soviet Union was not without its value as a contribution to a general relaxation of tension, a relaxation which is good for the world. Their very coming together was a good thing. The exchange of ideas between leaders of governments, however diverse their ideologies may be, an exchange of ideas in a free and frank manner, where the representatives of the governments are not shouting into a microphone, for the sake of world propaganda, is highly desirable in these days of strain and tension. A reading of the communique - one or two sentences of it - may help us to understand the gains achieved in terms of attitudes and new approachments and explorations, rather than in concrete significant acts. The communique, signed by both governments reads:

"These talks have been conducted, on both sides, in a spirit of candor and realism. They have ranged over most of the international questions of current concern, and there has been a full and useful exchange of views.

"The representatives of the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom recognize that the strengthening of Anglo-Soviet relations in political, trade, scientific, cultural and other fields would be in the interests of the peoples of both countries. They were also convinced that this would help to consolidate general peace and security.

"They expressed the determination of their Governments to work for a further relaxation of international tension.

"Having in view the present situation where there is not the necessary confidence between countries, they expressed their determination to take all possible measures to facilitate the strengthening of mutual confidence and the improvement of the relations between states. They recognize that one of the important factors in strengthening international confidence consists in personal contacts between leading statesmen which have produced positive results.

"The two countries, in their relations with each other and also in their relations with other countries, will be guided by the principles of the United Nations. They are convinced that the basis of friendly cooperation and peaceful co-existence of all countries, irrespective of their social systems, is respect for national independence and sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in the internal affairs of others."

Perhaps the most significant of the matters discussed of immediate importance, and perhaps the one upon which some conclusions were reached, had to do with the Middle East, with the Near East, with Israel and its relation with the Arab world. You will recall that last September, Czechoslovakia, a member of the Russian bloc, shipped vast quantities of armaments to Egypt and thereby created an imbalance of military strength, vis-a-vis the Arabs in Israel, which caused grave apprehensions in Israel and brought the prospects of war nearer. This issue was thoroughly canvassed at these meetings and they arrived at some conclusions. I again read from the communique:

"The United Kingdom and the Soviet Union have the firm intention to do everything in their power to facilitate the maintenance of peace and security in the Near and Middle East. For this purpose they will give the necessary support to the United Nations in its endeavor to strengthen peace in the region of Palestine and to carry out the appropriate decisions of the Security Council.

"The Governments of the two countries consider that effective measures should be undertaken in the immediate future to this end in accordance with the national aspirations of the peoples concerned, with the necessity of insuring their independence and in full conformity with the principles expressed in the Charter of the United Nations.

"The Governments of the two countries call on the states concerned to take measures to prevent the increase of tension in the area of the demarcation line established in accordance with the relevant armistice agreement between Israel and the Arab States.

"They will also support the United Nations in an initiative to secure a peaceful settlement on a mutually acceptable basis of the dispute between the Arab states and Israel.

"They recognize the importance of the problem of the refugees and accordingly will support action of the United Nations directed toward the alleviation of their hardships.

"The Governments of the two countries express the strong hope that other states will also do everything possible to help the United Nations in bringing about a peaceful solution of the dispute between the Arab states and Israel, and thus to strengthen peace and security in the Near and Middle East."

The importance of that, of course, is the fact that the Soviet Union places itself on record as favoring a peaceful solution in the Near East and not as an ally, an all-out ally, in support of the Arabs, an impression which had been given up to these meetings, by these vast shipments of arms to the Arab countries and an impression which the Arab countries, especially Egypt, took occasion to give wide currency to. The Arab peoples had gotten the impression that the Soviet Union was now behind them, on any policy which they would ~~like to~~ ^{likely} pursue ~~and~~ ^{or} wished to pursue, and that should they go to war on Israel the Soviet Union would solidly back them up. This position has now been publicly repudiated by the Soviet Union, and that has helped to clip the wings considerably of the aspirations, the political aspirations of the adventurers in Cairo and in Damascus and in Baghdad and elsewhere.

In the interview, before he left for Great Britain, Bulganin/^{even}stated that he is prepared to agree with other of the nations of the world to stop shipping arms to the Middle East altogether. Well this matter of course, should be faced with extreme caution. First of all, the shipping of arms to the Near East altogether would leave Israel at the tremendous disadvantage under which it suffers at the moment - this grave imbalance which has been created by the vast acquisition of arms on the part of Egypt - and on the other hand the question still remains open what the position of the Soviet Union will be when the question of a final peace settlement comes up. What will Israel be called upon to sacrifice in order to bring about peace in that part of the world? Where will ~~be~~ the Soviet Union be at that time? For that matter there is still the question where Great Britain will be at that time, and the United States. Nevertheless this new declaration on the part of the leaders of the Soviet Union may be viewed with a certain amount of satisfaction. Was this meeting between Great Britain and the Soviet Union

worth while? The Soviet Union seems to think so and Great Britain seems to think so. ~~XX~~ Foreign Minister Eden, as the Russians were leaving Great Britain, was interviewed and was asked whether he regarded the results of this meeting as worth while, and this is what he said and it is very significant, what he said:

* "The London discussions could be something very important**. They could be the beginning of a beginning.

"Bulganin said something at a press conference this morning which I want to quote because I agree with it so completely:"

(And he is now quoting Bulganin:)

"The program, as you see, is a solid one, and there is a good deal to work upon. We, the Soviet people, take the program seriously and will strive to turn it into reality."

"Well", (said Eden) "so will we. Even if only partly successful, we can contribute ~~thereby~~ to the peace of the world.

"There are some who think agreements of this kind have often disappointed us in the past. They say there is no use making them. I utterly disagree and want you to understand seriously where I stand in this.

"As long as I have any responsibility, we shall continue to work for solutions of these questions.

"For my part, I will not accept a situation where the great powers of the world stand lowering at each other and consume a large part of their wealth on armament expenditure. We have got to do better than that.

"It may be -- I think it is true -- that the immediate danger of war has receded, and that is good. Even if it is true, it is not enough.

"Here is our policy:

"We are not to be parted from our friends, nor will we abandon our vital interests. But we will seek agreements with all.

"In the long history of diplomacy, suspicion has done more harm than confidence." ~~Believe-me-that-is-true-~~

I'd like to repeat that sentence.

"In the long history of diplomacy, suspicion has done more harm than confidence. Believe me that is true.

"We shall follow the policies I have described to you, seeking agreements and promoting friendships.

"I am sure this Soviet visit was in tune with this and that as a result the world can rest more secure."

You may recall that on numerous occasions, when I discussed the relationship of the free world with the Soviet Union, I have in my humble way urged constantly, -- urged constantly -- the meeting of minds -- the value of conference -- the exchange of ideas. Not by way of persuading our people to lower their guards, but by way of doing the very thing that Prime Minister Eden has in mind. We've got to live together in the same world. There is no choice. The choice is between co-existence or no existence. Would I favor such a meeting between the heads of the Russian

Government and our own Government? I would. I do not know whether this is the moment- or in three months or in six months - but such meeting should be encouraged. Relaxations take place, of one kind or another, after all such meetings. I read the other day where our own government had now made possible the acquisition on the part of Russia of some seven hundred items of trade which heretofore had been prohibited. That's all to the good. Open avenues of trade- of commerce - of communication. That's the only way to clear the air. And Democracy will not suffer by it. Communism will suffer by it. I have sufficient strength - as has Mr. Eden - as have the British people - the oldest Democracy on earth - they have sufficient confidence in the strength of their own institution, their own ideas and of what democracy can give to people - to meet face to face with the leaders of the communist world and talk over outstanding issues in detail - in ~~pea~~ piece-meal, and try to lessen tensions and to increase confidence in the world. Its the only way.

And so I do not look, as some do, upon this Communist Salesman traveling to the Democratic countries with terrible apprehensions. Bulganin and Khrushchev didn't carry away from Great Britain, Big Ben or Westminster Abbey - they are still there. And I would like to see Democratic Salesmen go into Communist countries. Perhaps we are on the threshold of better days, after a generation which split the world, clear down the center.

1) Ever since the death of Stalin 3 yrs ago. the rulers ^{sermon 8974} of R. have been engaged on a campaign to make friends in the democratic world.

In the days of Stalin - the rulers of R. were engaged in a campaign to subvert the democ. world.

= this represents a fund. change - and if one maintains that it is only a change ^{only} in tactics and method - and does not represent a change in ultimate objectives - it is still an important and significant change. For tactics and methods have an intrinsic importance - this even - sometimes more desirable than the ultimate objectives - which ~~is~~ are really seldom attained.

= ^{Methods and} Methods have a way of interpreting so in the fabric of the ultimate outcome - and of determining ~~the~~ the final result.

2) Bulgaria and Khrushchev, visiting India ^{Burma, Afghanistan} and J. Kestanis were not out to commence a series of these conversations - or in some subtle and confirmational manner to undermine their free institutions and their accustomed way of life.

They are really not as naive as all that -

They were out to make friends for Russia - to create new markets for Russia - to end a long period of isolation which its own threatening revol. ideology and its own technique of revolution and subversion had imposed upon it.

They had previously talked abt. the possibility of capitalist -
communist co-existence - but only ~~as a~~ when hard-pressed
for an argument - and as a formal reassurance in an
emergency.

They were now in bad earnest about it. They wanted it
badly, and were ~~not~~ now making supreme efforts to get it.
- not so much as a means to something else - but as an
~~something in itself~~ and in itself - as something needed now
vigorously by the people, the Soviet Union.

3/ So earnest and urgent are they abt. it - that they are
proceeding rapidly and astoundingly to discredit the old
Stalinist regime - to downgrade the Stalinist regime - to discredit the old
leader - who had been enthroned on high for generations
on USSR - and whose the Stalinist regime was based on
which had been ardently cultivated throughout the communist world -
and taught to every school child in the Soviet Union - the
Chairman the Great Revolution and peace leader the world subject
this is today a heresy - St. is being assassinated this
year after his death.

The present Rulers, R. are probably blatantly more
brave in acknowledging the not alone the errors the past
regime - under which they themselves lived and in which they
themselves played no unimportant role - but those crimes
of tyranny and murder - instability justice wholesale persecution
of innocent people - with which the free world charged
communist Russia the less - & more despised

4). At the 20th Communist party Congress last February, Khrushchev⁽³⁾ declared. —

5). What a vindication of democ.! and of the contenders of the free world — out of the very mouth of an anti-communist! How self-~~condemned~~ accused and self-condemned the communists in the S. Union and their adherents and defenders elsewhere now stand!

6). For while denouncing the one many framing / States with which their collaborators — they are also denouncing and defrocking us!

A collective framing of 1/2 dog is a dog. even is no less human, and is capable of no less suppression of basic human rights and freedoms — and no less capable of criminal oppression and abuse than a one man framing.

7). The Latin new dictatorial junta is the plumed-headed hydra of autocracy — is giving the Latin people no freedom, not speech, assembly — no right of freedom of parties — no restoration nothing which we associate with the democ. way of life —

They are giving the Latin benefit of a multi-party collective dictatorship — a self-sufficient self-accountable dictatorship in place of law, abolish rule!

8). The world will welcome this ~~step~~ change - and as it (4)
points the way to the next step - the collapse, the
collective dictatorship in a crisis which will force us
in an era when the Russian people will rise up to
demand the right, free men and a charter of liberties

9). As to reasons behind the radical and startling change
fewer differ. The ~~most~~ best informed people here feel
that with the death of Stalin, the cards about him ~~decided~~ ^{being the}
that it was best for them - if not for the country, ^{because}
that no new dictator with absolute power would be
permitted. ^{It was a very easy} The privileges of a one-man dictator, to which
the Russian people had been sold, had to be discredited. The
Stalin legend had to be destroyed. The vast Russian people and
machines which reaches every town, village and factory, was put out
of action. - These books ^{which} ~~show~~ ^{show} exactly how the situation
other great books had been ruined and destroyed.
Of ~~the~~ ^{the} Communist party ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~had~~ ^{had} to be reorganized.
the power which it enjoyed under Lenin - and executive power
lodged in a group - many collective responsibilities

10). The new rulers, Russia feel that the self-labeled isolation
is no longer needed. or desirable. They ~~wish~~ ^{wish} to feel
that they can best serve his interests ^{not thus emphasizing}
subversion or violence - in other words, a military method
but then the method employed in the free world - friendly

RUSSIANS PROMISE CUTS IN ARMS SALE

Continued From Page 1

reconnoiter the Soviet position in world affairs.

Aside from the announced results the British Government considers the talks as well worthwhile.

The discussions, following a pattern long advocated by the Prime Minister, were private. There were no daily briefings of the press. Consequently both sides spoke their minds with the greatest freedom without thought of propaganda and its repercussions.

The British Ministers gained deeper appreciation of Soviet internal pressures and international attitudes. At the same time the Soviet leaders learned the full extent of British concern over the "highly inflammable" situation in the Middle East, the reality of the alliance between the United States and Britain and the blunt fact that it was useless to try to bully the British.

The Soviet leaders also gained the impression, both from conference sessions and their trips around Britain, that this is a balanced democracy whose people are calm and hard-headed. The Russians must know now, one source said, that neither the ministers nor the members of the public are likely to be swept off their feet by visitors, no matter how amiable or powerful.

Plain Speaking by British

British plain speaking during the talks concentrated mainly on the Middle East and it is in the affairs of that region that the British hope they have made the greatest progress. But this hope is attended by caution that it is now "up to them" to back words in London with deeds in Moscow.

Both Mr. Khrushchev and Marshal Bulganin attacked the Baghdad Pact, which joins Britain, Turkey, Iraq, Iran and Pakistan in defense of the Middle East. Sir Anthony retorted that the pact was designed partly to defend Iran against any Soviet attempt to undermine the government by support of the Audeh (Communist) party.

The British repeatedly stressed that the dangerous situation in the Middle East was being fed by Soviet-bloc sales of arms to Egypt. Sir Anthony gradually impressed the Soviet leaders with the idea that a conflict in the Middle East would probably be a damaging to the Soviet Union as to Britain and the United States.

Although the Communiqué does not describe them specifically, there was agreement on several points.

One is that the Soviet Union will exercise some restraint in the shipment of arms to the Middle East. The joint statement says the two governments "will do their utmost to put an end to the armaments race in all parts of the world, and thus to free the peoples of the world from the threat of a new war."

The British believe the Soviet Union now accepts the necessity of maintaining an "equilibrium" in armaments, thus insuring that no one side will become so strong that it can attack with impunity.

Significantly British officials emphasized tonight that they still considered the tripartite declaration of 1950 to be in force. This declaration pledged the United States, France and Britain to seek to maintain the status quo in the Middle East.

The Russians indicated in the talks that the Soviet Union would welcome any United Nations attempt to end the dispute between the Arab states and Israel. Both the British and Soviet Governments will support suggestions that Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld is expected to advance for a long-term settlement.

References to disarmament in the communiqué are blameless, the British concede. But they do not get East and West much closer and the considered outlook on progress in the United Nations Subcommittee on Disarmament is gloomy.

Such progress as was made, the British suggest, resulted from Sir Anthony's assurances that both Britain and the United States sincerely seek disarmament.

Trade to Be Expanded

Soviet efforts to break Brit-

Statements Issued

LONDON, April 26 (AP)—Following are the texts of a joint communiqué on the discussions between British and Soviet leaders, of an appendix on contacts between their countries and of a statement by the British Foreign Office:

The Communiqué

From April 18 to 27, 1956, Mr. [Nikolai A.] Bulganin, the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Mr. Nikita S. Khrushchev, member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, visited the United Kingdom at the invitation of Her Majesty's Government. During their stay they held a series of conversations with the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Sir Anthony Eden; the Lord Privy Seal, Mr. R. A. Butler; the Foreign Secretary, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, and other members of Her Majesty's Government on Anglo-Soviet relations as well as on the international situation as a whole.

These talks have been conducted, on both sides, in a spirit of candor and realism. They have ranged over most of the international questions of current concern, and there has been a full and useful exchange of views.

The representatives of the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom recognize that the strengthening of Anglo-Soviet relations in political, trade, scientific, cultural and other fields would be in the interests of the peoples of both countries. They were also convinced that this would help to consolidate general peace and security.

They expressed the determination of their Governments to work for a further relaxation of international tension.

Having in view the present situation where there is not the necessary confidence between countries, they expressed their determination to take all possible measures to facilitate the strengthening of mutual confidence and the improvement of the relations between states. They recognize that one of the important factors in strengthening international confidence consists in personal contacts between leading statesmen, which have produced positive results.

The two countries, in their relations with each other and also in their relations with other countries, will be guided by the principles of the United Nations. They are convinced that the basis of friendly cooperation and peaceful co-existence of all countries, irrespective of their social systems, is respect for national independence and sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in the internal affairs of others.

They will do their utmost to put an end to the armaments race in all parts of the world, and thus to free the peoples of the world from the threat of a new war.

The representatives of both countries attached particular importance to maintaining security in Europe, being convinced that peace and security in Europe are of determining importance in preserving the peace of the world. But an understanding on the means to achieve that end was not reached.

As regards the other unsettled international problems, including those of Europe and Asia, on which an exchange of views has taken place, both parties will strive to promote a solution in the interests of consolidating general peace.

The representatives of the Soviet Union and of the United Kingdom have come to the following conclusions with regard to certain individual problems which have been under consideration:

Near and Middle East

The United Kingdom and the Soviet Union have the firm intention to do everything in their power to facilitate the maintenance of peace and security in the Near and Middle East. For this purpose they will give the necessary support to the United Nations in its endeavor to strengthen peace in the region of Palestine and to carry out the appropriate decisions of the Security Council.

The Governments of the two countries consider that effective measures should be undertaken in the immediate future to this end in accordance with

HOMAGE: Nikita S. Khrushchev of Karl Marx as Soviet Premier

the national aspirations of the peoples concerned, with the necessity of insuring their independence and in full conformity with the principles expressed in the Charter of the United Nations.

The Governments of the two countries call on the states concerned to take measures to prevent the increase of tension in the area of the demarcation line established in accordance with the relevant armistice agreement between Israel and the Arab states.

They will also support the United Nations in an initiative to secure a peaceful settlement on a mutually acceptable basis of the dispute between the Arab states and Israel.

They recognize the importance of the problem of the refugees and accordingly will support action of the United Nations directed toward the alleviation of their hardships.

The Governments of the two countries express the strong hope that other states will also do everything possible to help the United Nations in bringing about a peaceful solution of the dispute between the Arab states and Israel, and thus to strengthen peace and security in the Near and Middle East.

The Problem of Disarmament

In the course of the exchange of views the disarmament problem was discussed. The representatives of the two countries reviewed the position reached in the discussions in the United Nations and the proposals made by the powers concerned. It was agreed that a solution of this problem would be of the utmost significance for the maintenance of universal peace.

The Government of the Soviet Union and the Government of the United Kingdom attach great importance to concluding an appropriate international agreement on this problem. Such an agreement would help to reduce international tension, to increase confidence between states and to relieve the burden of military expenditures.

The two Governments agreed on the paramount importance of saving humanity from the threat of nuclear warfare. Their common objective remains the ultimate prohibition of nuclear weapons and the devotion of nuclear energy exclusively to peaceful uses, and they will continue their efforts to achieve this aim.

The Governments of the So-

staled.

He also rejected the contention of various critics, including Adlai E. Stevenson, that the United States was losing the "cold war."

"If by cold war you mean merely to keep alive hatred of Russia, or to keep the Russians permanently ostracized, and to deny them any access to the free world, then I suppose it could be judged that we are not winning," Mr. Dulles said.

He added, however, that the danger of actual war had diminished and there were signs of change in Moscow. Saying that the basic objective of the "cold war" as he saw it was to "do away with the great danger of hot war," Mr. Dulles claimed a "great victory in the cold war" for the West.

But the corrected transcript issued five hours later by the State Department toned down this contention. It had Mr. Dulles saying: "* * * if, in fact, the Soviet Union is not as much to be feared as it was, if it has become more tolerant, if it has put aside the use of violence, if it is beginning to move in a liberal way within, then I would call that progress toward victory in the cold war."

His comment was made in response to a question about a

north.

road fr
a lone
the flo

Conti

Ste
Ha

Two
for the
nomina
a revis
in the
projecte
continen
gen bon

Adlai
the Sov
would h
demande
United
project.
Adminis
gerously

Gover
was in
the asse
Khrushch
nist part
Britain. I
is to frigi
ing the U
air bases
the North

Continued on Page 2, Column 3

'Beginning of a Beginning'

But the London discussions could be something very important all the same. They could be the beginning of a beginning.

Bulganan said something at a press conference this morning which I want to quote because I agree with it so completely:

"The program, as you see, is a solid one, and there is a good deal to work upon. We, the Soviet people, take the program seriously and will strive to turn it into reality."

Well, so will we. Even if only partly successful, we can contribute thereby to the peace of the world.

There are some who think agreements of this kind have often disappointed us in the past. They say there is no use making them. I utterly disagree and want you to understand seriously where I stand in this.

As long as I have any responsibility, we shall continue to work for solutions of these questions.

For my part, I will not accept a situation where the great powers of the world stand lowering at each other and consume a large part of their wealth on armament expenditure. We have got to do better than that.

It may be—I think it is true—that the immediate danger of war has receded, and that is good. Even if it is true, it is not enough.

Here is our policy:

We are not to be parted from our friends, nor will we abandon our vital interests. But we will seek agreements with all.

In the long history of diplomacy, suspicion has done more harm than confidence. Believe me, that is true.

We shall follow the policies I have described to you, seeking agreements and promoting friendships.

I am sure this Soviet visit was in tune with this and that as a result the world can rest more secure.