

inspection in the Arctic regions as other than a deliberate attempt to divert public opinion from the threat to peace which is created by the provocative actions of the air force of the USA.

The statesmen of the USA declare that the American air force will as before make flights to the Soviet borders, that is, will continue to play with fire, because the USSR does not comply with their demands about control in the Arctic region. In other words, there is an attempt to exert pressure on the Soviet Union in order to thrust upon it plans which are contrary to the interests of its security and advantageous to only one side - the USA. With regard to the Soviet Union such attempts are, of course, hopeless. If those who resort to them took into account at least the lessons of history they would probably have long since come to the conclusion that this method should be discarded, and that it was necessary to consider both the security interests of the USA and those of the Soviet Union. We call on the USA and the other members of NATO to adopt this approach, the only one which is sound.

If the Soviet Union resorted to the methods used by the USA it would have to act approximately as follows: since the USA did not agree to its proposal about means of preventing surprise attack by one state on another, in particular to its proposal about setting up two zones of aerial inspection, of which one was to embrace the Eastern part of the USSR and the Western part of the USA, then Soviet bombers with hydrogen bombs should be sent to the borders of the USA. You can hardly deny, Mr. Prime Minister, that in such a case there would be a complete similarity with the present actions of the USA.

What would be the attitude in the USA towards such action, as well as the attitude of those who advocate the above-mentioned American proposal? There is no reason to doubt that these activities would have been met with a negative reaction.

I will tell you frankly that in our opinion, no one of the steps on the part of the USA as well as of the other members of NATO, has exposed with such profoundness the perversity of these countries on the crucial problems of reducing international tension and ending the "cold war" as has the moving of a proposal on inspection in the Arctic region. The putting forward of this proposal indicates how remote the intentions of its sponsors are from the genuine desire to reduce the danger of a surprise attack and to eliminate the danger of war.

Now let us return to the problem of the cessation of nuclear weapons tests. It goes without saying that nobody will object that an international agreement on ending such tests is more desirable than a decision adopted by one side. But the insufficiency of such a decision lies not in the fact that it is, as you note, of a conditional character, that it could be revoked if necessary, but in the fact that the two other powers possessing nuclear weapons - the USA and Great Britain - refuse to end their tests, both unilaterally and under an agreement. The unilateral cessation of tests will remain unilateral until all the powers disposing of the nuclear weapon stop testing it. And when