

## 'London deal on Germany' from the Soviet news (16 June 1948)

**Caption:** On 16 June 1948, the periodical Soviet News condemns the conclusions of the Six-Power Conference held in London and deplores the agreement of principle which seeks to establish an International Authority for the Ruhr (IAR) so as to regulate coal and steel production in the area.

**Source:** Soviet news. 16.06.1948, n° 1962. London: Press Department of the Soviet Embassy in London.

**Copyright:** All rights of reproduction, public communication, adaptation, distribution or dissemination via Internet, internal network or any other means are strictly reserved in all countries.

The documents available on this Web site are the exclusive property of their authors or right holders.

Requests for authorisation are to be addressed to the authors or right holders concerned.

Further information may be obtained by referring to the legal notice and the terms and conditions of use regarding this site.

**URL:** [http://www.cvce.eu/obj/london\\_deal\\_on\\_germany\\_from\\_the\\_soviet\\_news\\_16\\_june\\_1948-en-d4096be5-40fe-4700-a8cd-f14622861dbd.html](http://www.cvce.eu/obj/london_deal_on_germany_from_the_soviet_news_16_june_1948-en-d4096be5-40fe-4700-a8cd-f14622861dbd.html)

**Publication date:** 31/10/2012

## London deal on Germany

By V. Marinin

*From an article in "Pravda":—*

THE London Three-Power Conference of the U.S.A., Britain and France, which the Benelux countries were allowed to attend, has ended. The decisions of the Conference have been announced in two communiqués and a special appendix. Not satisfied with this, the U.S. State Department published on June 7 its own additional interpretation of these decisions, under the title "Explanation of the Recommendations of the London Conference on Germany."

It would be naive to think that these documents exhaust the essential decisions of the London Conference. The course of its proceedings, the trend and character of a number of measures to be realised by the participants on the basis of the so-called Brussels bloc, leave no doubt that in regard to certain of the recommendations adopted in London the organisers are maintaining a stubborn silence.

But even what has been published raises with sufficient clarity the question of the character and content of the programme adopted in London. It is a question of a far-reaching political programme, which from beginning to end contradicts the letter and the spirit of the Potsdam Conference and is a gross violation of the Potsdam Agreement.

The experience of the three post-war years has confirmed the correctness of the decisions adopted at Potsdam in 1945. This programme is the most effective guarantee of international security against the possibility of renewed German aggression, for it proposes the international co-operation of the four Powers, the genuine democratisation of Germany, the transformation of Germany into a peaceful, democratic State.

The London programme, on the other hand, considers as a guiding principle the policy of the Anglo-American ruling circles which have renounced the principle of co-operation of the four Powers as regards the German problem, and, instead of the democratisation of Germany, aims to preserve and consolidate German monopoly capital.

\*

This is nothing else than a programme for the dismemberment of Germany and at the same time of the whole of Europe, a programme which encourages the Ruhr magnates and envisages agreement with them on the basis of converting Western Germany into an American strategic base for future aggression in Europe. That is why this programme is fraught with serious consequences for European and international security.

It is no accident that the London decisions say nothing at all about the preparation of the peace treaty with Germany. The system constructed in London proposes least of all the solution of the German problem in the spirit of peaceful settlement. Quite the contrary, it is directly calculated to drag out as long as possible the conclusion of the peace treaty with Germany.

What are the final outlines of the system adopted in London? The Western German regions are formed into a separate State headed by a West German puppet government. In the next few months a puppet Constitutional Assembly will be staged, for the adoption of the Constitution drafted by the Anglo-American authorities.

"Control" is established over the Ruhr through a special organ, in which the U.S.A., Britain and Western Germany command nine votes out of 15, while the remainder are distributed between France and the Benelux countries.

Since the German representatives are appointed by the control organ of the occupying Powers, and the right to vote will be exercised on behalf of Germany by the Powers which share the responsibility for the

economic administration of that part of Germany which includes the Ruhr (i.e., the U.S.A. and Britain), the U.S.A. and Britain receive nine votes out of 15, thus becoming full masters of this so-called “International Control Agency.”

By what will these masters be guided in their activity? The Hamburg newspaper *Die Welt*, an organ issued under licence from the British occupation authorities, writes rather frankly: “The key to the understanding of American policy in Western Germany lies in the interest displayed by the Americans in the German chemical, steel and coal industries.”

While defining the rights and prerogatives of the “Control Agency,” the Tripartite Conference started from the premise that administration of and control over industry in the Ruhr will be fully in American hands. The functions of the “Control Agency” are therefore limited to distribution of coke, coal and steel.

But since American capitalist monopolies become actual masters of all the Ruhr industry and since the Americans and British will enjoy a majority in the “Control Agency,” it is perfectly clear that no efficient control is to be expected from this agency which, in point of fact, will be a mere American office for distribution of American produce.

\*

The Anglo-American stage managers again bring on to the political scene the Ruhr magnates, who suffered a devastating defeat in the war. In the course of the last three years, German cartels, syndicates and trusts in Western Germany, far from being decentralised, have even grown, thus preparing the ground for a new spurt of activity.

In an article entitled “Scandal in the Nazi Ruhr?” the American newspaper *New York Post* accuses the ruling circles of the U.S.A. and Britain of restoring a Nazi State in Western Germany. “American officials,” the newspaper writes, “welcome fascism in Germany in its usual form, for it brings big profits to influential U.S. industrial and financial concerns.”

The “control” over the Ruhr envisaged by the London “recommendations” to all practical purposes means the establishment of an American-Ruhr bloc assigned to play a definite part not only inside but also outside Western Germany.

This circumstance will inevitably result in granting Western Germany priority as compared with other European countries. It is not fortuitous that the Vice-Chairman of the International Bank of Reconstruction, Garner, emphasised that the establishment of a “West German Government” would make it possible to grant the Ruhr considerable credits over and above those envisaged by the Marshall plan.

The British and French Governments, with extraordinary haste, officially endorsed the recommendations of the London Conference. These actions run counter to the obvious feelings of large sections of the British and French public. Therefore, official endorsement of the London programme ushers in, in these countries, an era of intense struggle against the London decisions.