

L'HUMANITE says that enormous progress made in the Soviet Union in the field of nuclear energy is a guarantee of peace. The success of this test, says the paper, has created favorable conditions for (the struggle?) for peace. The struggle can bring benefit at a moment when the disarmament question has been excluded from the U.N. agenda.

Cairo--The Egypt n press has published the TASS statement on the latest tests of thermonuclear weapons in the Soviet Union. All papers have also reported Khrushchev's words: "Let these bombs lie and get on the nerves of those who would like to start a war."

USSR WILLING TO BAN NUCLEAR ARMS TESTS

Moscow, in English to North America, Nov. 29, 1955, 0001 GMT--E

(Commentary by Nikolai Andreyev on reaction in United States to the USSR bomb test)

(Text)

Much of the American radio and press comment on the H-bomb tests boils down to the remark that the Soviet Union talks about wanting disarmament but manufactures H-bombs. And the conclusion is drawn that the Soviet Union is insincere, that its proposals for disarmament are nothing but propaganda.

It seems to me there is one sure-fire method of determining whether the Soviet Union is sincere, and not just making propaganda. And that is to accept the proposal. If Western quarters are so certain that what this country suggests in the way of disarmament is nothing but propaganda, they risk nothing in accepting it. Those who go in for propaganda rarely act on their word. One can see that (by?) the position of the United States and the other Western Powers on the issue of disarmament. It was the West that proposed (limits?) for the Armed Forces of the Big Five, periods for outlawing nuclear weapons, and disarmament in stages. But as soon as the Soviet Union accepted these proposals, they turned out to be unacceptable to the Western Powers.

Is it not more proper to speak here of insincerity and propaganda? I am sure many think so. The Soviet Union has not only made concrete disarmament proposals, but has taken action in that direction. It is reducing national armed strength by 640,000 men, and it has abolished its military bases at Port Arthur in the Far East, and Porkkala in Finland, the only two bases it has (owned?).

But with the United States and the other Western Powers still arming, the Soviet Union can go no farther in disarming. Anyone can understand that. Nor can we discontinue the production and testing of nuclear weapons, so long as both the United States and Britain manufacture such weapons and test them.

The proposals which the Soviet Union put before the United Nations stipulate a total ban on nuclear weapons, and their removal from national armaments. And as one of the first moves to disarmament, the Soviet Union suggests that the countries having nuclear weapons pledge to discontinue their testing. We are ready to do so right here and now, if the other powers with such weapons agree to the same.

Strangely enough, the Soviet representatives in the U.N. Disarmament Subcommittee are still alone with their proposals. The Western spokesmen not only refuse to accept them, they have even renounced many of their own proposals on this issue. The United States continues to stock and improve nuclear weapons, and it is claimed this is needed to keep a balance.

But in that case, the Soviet Union also needs to keep a balance, and what do we arrive at then? Instead of competing and bettering the life of the people, countries would have to compete in the manufacture of armaments.

We object, the Soviet people and their Government want the arms race stopped all over the world. We should like to compete with the United States in peaceful progress, in raising the standard of living, not in turning out A-bomb and H-bombs. But for that, both sides must be willing, and a concrete agreement for disarmament must be reached. Yet Britain, the United States and France even refuse to (agree?) with the Soviet Union not to be the first to employ atomic



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REPOSITORY *Emmehausen Library*
COLLECTION *NSC-OCB Central Files Series*
BOX No. 9
FOLDER *OCB 000.9 (Atomic Energy)*
(File # 4) (1) Dec. 1955 - 5th day 1956

be reached. Yet Britain, the United States and France even refuse to (agree?) with the Soviet Union not to be the first to employ atomic weapons.

~~So who is it that is insincere and is merely making propaganda? I leave that for you to judge.~~

~~PEARSON: U.S. STAND OBSTRUCTS CONTACTS~~

~~Moscow, TASS, in Russian Hellschreiber, to Europe, Nov. 26, 1955, 2315 GMT--L~~

~~(An American observer on U.S. policy as regards contacts between West and East)~~

~~(Text)~~

~~New York, Nov. 27--The American observer Drew Pearson, replying to the assertions of those workers and representatives of the U.S. press who allege that "the spirit of Geneva is dead," writes in the DAILY MIRROR: "One cannot destroy at once the main achievement of the Geneva Conference at the summit, held in July.~~

"The tests," continues the paper, "have given the Soviets anew, advantageous opportunity to come forth with an appeal to ban atomic weapons." Passing over with silence the well-known Soviet proposals on the questions of armament reduction and ban on weapons of mass extermination, the New York HERALD TRIBUNE cynically alleges that the Soviet Union has not "given an proof of a more or less real preparedness to diminish her advantages in the field of the usual armaments." The paper opposes a ban on atomic and hydrogen weapons.

Paris--Today's papers emphasize the TASS statement on the thermonuclear tests. Most papers underline the silences saying that the Soviet Government always has stood for a ban on atomic and hydrogen weapons and establishment of effective international control. Several papers mention the "lack of precision in translation" of the place in Khrushchev's speech mentioning that the force of explosion of the (one word missing--Ed.) bomb "equal to that of several millions of tons of conventional explosives." Earl reports of the Western press spoke about the force of explosion equalling (words missing--Ed.).

LE FIGARO (passage missing--Ed.) it follows that it can be transported by an airplane. "The United States plans extensive tests in the field of atomic energy for the next spring," says the paper, "and this permits us to draw the conclusion that the Americans are lagging 6 months behind the Russians, if not in the field of scientific research, then at least in the field of tests."

Further on, without any basis, the paper attempts to cast doubt on the sincerity of the Soviet Union's peaceful policy. The paper asserts that the test explosion of the hydrogen bomb in the USSR allegedly "gives the opportunity to doubt the Russians' good will in their 'peace offensive,'" and FRANC TIREUR attempts to persuade its readers that "this explosion has annihilated the Geneva spirit," while the EXPRESSE stresses that part of Khrushchev's speech from which it can be deduced that the tests of the Soviet hydrogen bomb should be a warning for those who would like to unleash a new world war.

At the Geneva Conference of the Four Power Foreign Ministers, recalls LIBERATION, the United States rejected the USSR proposal on the moral condemnation of atomic and hydrogen weapons and refused to sign undertakings not to be the first to use these weapons. The paper states that the United States thereby supported a resumption of the arms race. The paper calls for the prohibition of any atomic and hydrogen bomb tests in the future.

...the following: The beginning was laid on the basis of which the Russians and the Americans can talk to each other in a friendly manner and learn to know each other. This is a most important beginning which leads to friendship among people--the main achievement, for which we must be grateful for the Geneva.

Pointing out that in the United States a tendency had arisen "to blame the Russians for the present failure in Geneva"--at the conference of Foreign Ministers--Pearson writes: "However, even in July of this year, when Eisenhower was still conducting talks with Buzanin, there was concrete proof of the fact that some people close to him did not wish Geneva to have very much success. For instance, some of the American military men quite frankly expressed fears that too many smiles exchanged between the United States and Russia could lead to the reduction of their appropriations.

"At the same time the State Department began to carry out a petty policy of reducing the exchanges of delegations to a very small number. When the proposal was made to exchange delegations of agricultural experts on wheat growing, the State Department gave a negative reply in its letter. When an attempt was made to come to an agreement on the trip of 10 Soviet farmers in connection with the sale of seeds to Russia, they attempted to suppress the matter.

"Our diplomats who hide their heads in sand have not understood that while the State Department prevented dozens of Russians from coming to the United States, several thousand Russians were touring other countries and were receiving return visits."

Pearson comes to the conclusion that "a demand by individual Americans and groups that an exchange of delegations be carried out can overcome the red tape of the State Department," because, as he says, "the official policy of the United States as it was presented by the President himself, consists of helping such friendly relations."

Talk by Volgin

Moscow, in English, to North America, Nov. 27, 1955, 0025 GMT--E

(Text)

Boris Izakov, Anatoli Sofronov, and other Soviet journalists have just returned to Moscow from the United States. I have seen them, and they all say that what struck them most during their tour of the United States was the hospitality and kindness of the people.