

1962

**GENERAL AND COMPLETE
DISARMAMENT
IS A
GUARANTEE OF PEACE
AND
SECURITY FOR ALL NATIONS**

Published by
Soviet Booklets, 3 Rosary Gardens, London, S.W.7.
Printed by Farleigh Press Ltd. (T.U. all depts.),
Aldenham, Herts.

*Nikita Khrushchov Addresses
World Congress for General
Disarmament and Peace*

After
1962

Speaking in Moscow on July 10 at the World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace, Nikita Khrushchov, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, made the following speech in the Palace of Congresses

Scanned / Transcribed by
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus – London Bureaux

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/intro.htm>

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/english/home/index.php>



GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT IS A GUARANTEE OF PEACE AND SECURITY FOR ALL NATIONS

Nikita Khrushchov Addresses World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace

DEAR Delegates and Guests of the World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace, Dear Fellow-Fighters for Peace, Comrades and Friends, to begin with, allow me, on behalf of the Soviet government and the people of our country to welcome you here and to thank you for picking Moscow as the place for this, history's most representative congress of spokesmen of the forces of peace. All the Soviet people are in heart and spirit here with you in this hall, because the goals of the congress coincide to the letter with their most cherished hopes.

The World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace is one of the most significant events of our time.

Spokesmen of nearly all the nations of our globe, people of different races and nationalities, classes and social groups, parties and political convictions, men and women of the various religions, and atheists have put aside all that divides them and have come together to discuss the most urgent issue of our time—how to rule out war.

Mankind is living in a momentous epoch. The unprecedented acceleration of social progress, the remarkable advance in science and technology, and in our knowledge of nature, are capable of giving all people on earth the greatest blessings.

But we must never forget that the sinister forces of aggression and evil threaten to turn the achievements of human genius against mankind and civilisation.

Vigorous and immediate action by all sections of the people is called for to put the handcuffs, once and for all, on the criminal hands stretching out towards the buttons of a nuclear rocket war. The success of the effort to unify all peoples, and all who want to live and build, against the threat of a new world war, depends largely on the champions of peace. So may this responsibility to mankind provide inspiration for the delegates to this congress!

1. Disarmament—The Compelling Need of Our Time

Dear friends, like the heads of the other governments participating in the Geneva disarmament negotiations, I have been invited to tell the congress about my country's standpoint on the question of general and complete disarmament. The Soviet government has accepted the invitation with grati-

tude, and considers it its duty to outline for the congress its views on this most important problem of our time.

We must all face the facts squarely. The threat of a new world war really exists. Mankind may be drawn into it, if determined measures are not taken. It is all too obvious that thermonuclear weapons are being continuously improved and that the accumulation of these weapons in the arsenals is reaching the critical point when, as we used to say, the guns begin to speak of their own accord, and, as we can now say, paraphrasing this saying, when rockets, with thermonuclear warheads, begin to fly.

Nuclear weapons are being deployed in an increasing number of countries. More and more military units are getting them. This adds continually to the danger of the adventurist groups starting a new world war.

Never before have war preparations proceeded on so gigantic a scale as today.

The league of monopolies of the war industry, the "merchants of death" and the inveterate militarists—this "military-industrial complex," as ex-President Eisenhower described it—is hotting up the arms race to a frenzy. Competent western nuclear scientists estimate that the "nuclear death potential" in the contemporary world amounts to 250,000 megatons, or 250,000 millions tons of TNT.

This makes more than 80 tons of explosive for every inhabitant of our planet, and explosives, as you see, are a product that the world population has in abundant supply.

Even according to official figures, the world is spending 120,000 million dollars on war needs every year. This is equal to about half the capital investments made in the world economy. It is equal to about two-thirds of the total national income of all the economically underdeveloped countries. The N.A.T.O. countries alone are spending a million dollars every ten minutes on war preparations!

The United States ranks first as regards the scale of its war preparations. In 17 years; from 1946 to 1962, direct and indirect U.S. military expenditures added up to something like 900,000 million dollars, or nearly as much as all the capitalist countries combined spent in the Second World War. The other N.A.T.O. countries are following the same disastrous path of military waste. Their war machine has grown to fantastic proportions.

The arms race is consuming a colossal amount of the people's labour. Today, more than 20 million people are serving in the armed forces. And more than 100 million are devoting their energy to military purposes. Seventy per cent of the world's scientific personnel are, in one form or another, employed in the military sphere. The threat that militarism will engulf civilian society is becoming a reality in the western countries.

Recently the western press has been harping on the claim that the dangers of a thermonuclear war and its consequences are highly exaggerated. The United States, it is said, can afford to start such a war, because it will not be much worse than an ordinary one. It will simply involve a "somewhat" greater number of victims, "somewhat" greater material losses, and will make rehabilitation only "somewhat" more difficult. In order to survive it,

it is said, one need only build shelters in advance and adapt oneself to the mole's way of life.

There was a time when ex-President Eisenhower, and then his successor, President Kennedy, were realistic, and said that the military strengths of the Soviet Union and the United States were equal. This was President Kennedy's attitude at the time of our Vienna meeting. At present, however, the U.S. leadership has set out to impress it upon their own people and upon the peoples in the allied countries, that the balance of strength has tipped in favour of the United States. The aim of these contentions is quite plain. By saying that they will win the war, the American militarists are trying to put heart into their own armed forces, and into those of their allies.

This dangerous concept is in itself aimed at increasing the tension in international affairs and adding to the war threat, but from the point of view of reality, it doesn't have a leg to stand on.

I wonder how the American leaders came to work out that the ratio of strength had changed in their favour? They have nothing to back up this claim. If the matter were examined objectively, the state of affairs would look entirely different. In order to ensure its security, the Soviet Union has been forced to develop over the last few years nuclear weapons of 50, 100 and more megatons; inter-continental rockets; the global rocket which is practically invulnerable to defence; and an anti-missile rocket. The ruling groups of the United States, who do not possess similar powerful military weapons, have no reason at all to say that the balance of strength has changed in their favour.

It is common knowledge that relative strength is measured in military action and, more precisely, by the outcome of a war. In his day, Hitler kept saying that he had a tremendous margin of strength, but he was overwhelmed by the Soviet Union and its allies. Today, when there are nuclear rocket weapons to hand, errors in judging the balance of strength are incalculably more dangerous to the peoples. Who can tell, for example, how many 100-megaton bombs are needed to destroy the cities of, say, Western Germany? Or of the other powers whose leaders are in a bellicose mood? The false claims by the U.S. leadership that the balance of forces is in favour of the U.S.A., not the Soviet Union, are fraught with the greatest peril both for the peoples of other countries, and for the American people.

Recently the militarists have been talking more and more about thermonuclear war. They are building up a kind of thermonuclear war cult. Take Defence Secretary McNamara's speech of June 16. It is a typical example. In it he says that an understanding may be reached that nuclear weapons should be used solely for striking at armed forces, not at big cities. The U.S. press says that McNamara's statement had the approval of the White House, and interprets it as a sort of proposal to the Soviet Union regarding "rules" of conduct for nuclear war.

What is there to say about this "proposal"?

It is a monstrous proposal, filled from beginning to end with a man-hating contempt for peoples, for mankind, because it seeks to legalise nuclear war and thereby the murder of millions upon millions of people.

It shows that certain groups in the United States want to divert the main blow on to the countries that have American bases and armed forces, countries like Italy, Turkey, Britain, Western Germany, Japan, Greece, and so on.

Lastly, it is also the grossest of deceptions as far as the people of the United States are concerned. Are there no armed forces in the big cities and in their neighbourhood? Won't the nuclear bombs—exploded according to McNamara's "rules" in, say, the suburbs of New York—scorch that immense city with their deadly breath? Some countries do not have big cities such as the U.S.A. has, and the destruction of medium-size towns, townships and villages seems to be within the "rules" proposed by McNamara.

And aren't the people of medium-size towns and villages, on which McNamara sees fit to shower atomic bombs, just as dear as the population of the big cities?

We believe that what we must agree upon isn't the rules of nuclear war, but how to eliminate the very possibility of its breaking out.

Then towns, big and small, would remain intact and all townships, villages and farming communities would remain intact as well.

In present conditions, world war must not be measured by old criteria and considered in outworn categories. We have to face up to the fact that the weapons of war have changed radically, from the bottom up, and that their destructive force has increased to unheard of proportions. What does this imply?

First, modern weapons cannot in any way be compared to the old. The explosive force of just one powerful hydrogen bomb is many times greater than that of all the explosives used in all the wars in history, including the First and Second World Wars.

Second, nuclear rocket war completely erases the line between the battlefield and the rear. What is more, it is the civilian population that will be the first victim of the weapons of mass annihilation. In a war of that sort, just a few thermonuclear bombs are liable to wipe out whole countries, let alone the biggest industrial centres, with populations of many millions.

American experts estimate that one 20-megaton H-bomb, exploded in the air, would raze to the ground all brick and frame houses within a range of 24 kilometres* from the epicentre of the explosion. A roaring ocean of flame would engulf everything that burns, all living beings, over a stretch equal to the distance from New York to Philadelphia. Yet there are now bombs of fifty, a hundred and even more megatons. Scientists estimate roughly that the world stockpile of nuclear weapons is by now equal in force to 12,500,000 bombs of the kind dropped on Hiroshima.

Last but not least, with the present alignment of forces and the new types of weapons, the nuclear war advocated by the American militarists would not be confined to the territories of just two countries. It would be universal and would bring destruction and death to millions of people all over the world. What would that cost mankind? One of the outstanding fighters against atomic death, the prominent American scientist Linus Pauling,

* 15 miles approx.

estimates in his book, *No More War*, that the probable number of victims of a nuclear war will be 800 million. This is a grim truth about the actual nature of thermonuclear war, and if the western statesmen today keep this truth from the peoples, they are committing a crime against mankind, the peoples of their own countries included.

Those who are balancing on the "brink of war" maintain that nuclear rocket weapons are in themselves a sufficient guarantee that peace will prevail. This conception, known in the West as the "equilibrium of fear", is contrary to common sense and constitutes gross deception of the people. In actual fact the "equilibrium of fear" signboard is being used to camouflage plans for a preventive war. Some responsible U.S. statesmen go to the length of saying publicly that they are prepared to take the "initiative in a nuclear conflict with the Soviet Union".

Give this some thought. It is not a mere threat of thermonuclear war, but an attempt to impose an ill-omened competition as to who will be first to start the war. By saying that they can be the first to start a war, they seem to give the cue to other countries. Hurry, they say, and outdo your adversary.

What is this likely to lead to? The consequences will obviously be disastrous. It was a surprising statement to make. Its authors have given no thought to what war holds in store for the United States itself, and for its allies. The U.S. politicians are telling their people more and more insistently that in a nuclear war the United States will suffer smaller losses than the Soviet Union and are alleging that it can get the upper hand. This is a fatuous illusion. It is meant to condition public opinion in the United States and the allied countries to war: "We must hurry and start the war now," they say, "for the situation may change." This is nothing but conditioning men's minds to the inevitability of war and vindicating the aggressive forces which are eager to speed the outbreak of an atomic war.

But we declare most firmly: If the aggressors start a nuclear war, they themselves will inevitably perish in its flames.

It should be borne in mind that in a world of international tension even a simple mistake may cause the lightning-like chain reaction of a universal war. Take the case of General Power, who heads the U.S. Strategic Air Command. In November 1961, after a false alarm, he ordered bombers stationed at all United States bases to head for the Soviet Union. He did not even bother to inform the United States President, that is to say, the supreme commander of the country's armed forces, about this. For all of twelve and a half minutes the American Strategic Air Command was virtually in a state of war with the Soviet Union. Who is to guarantee that in the event of another false alarm the over-zealous American generals will sound the retreat before disaster breaks loose?

There is a big danger that war may break out owing to some technical miscalculation. Crashes of American planes carrying atom and hydrogen bombs, and of rockets with nuclear warheads, are growing in number. Only a few weeks ago, on June 4, a Thor rocket was destroyed in the air owing to some technical faults, and its nuclear warhead fell somewhere in the

Pacific Ocean. The same thing happened on June 20. And things like that are very alarming. *Giustizia*, an Italian newspaper, commented quite rightly that "the runaway Thor could have set off a world war". This shows once again how dangerous to peace is the atomic hysteria of the reactionary western militarist groups.

As long as the various national stockpiles of lethal weapons remain and grow, the war threat will grow also. The path to genuine peace is general and complete disarmament.

Dear delegates, I know that people of many and diverse political beliefs are assembled in this hall. They haven't gathered here to discuss the advantages of different social systems. It is the common wish, the desire to salvage peace, to avert the ordeal of thermonuclear war, that has brought us all here.

But one cannot help reminding this worldwide forum that the aggressive forces are pursuing the arms race and preparations for a new world war behind a smokescreen of talk about a war threat emanating from the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. These malicious falsehoods must not be ignored. Let me recall a few undeniable facts.

Ten million people were killed and twenty million crippled in the First World War. Was it the communists, or the socialist states, that were responsible for that war? At the time it broke out there were then no socialist countries on earth, and in no country were the communists in power.

The Second World War cost nearly fifty million lives. Was it the communists, the socialist countries, who started it? The Second World War was started by German, Italian and Japanese fascists. It was the Soviet Union that suffered the greatest losses, in the act of saving mankind from fascist barbarity. It was the Soviet Union that made the greatest contribution to defeating the fascists and delivering the peoples from the death camps, the gas chambers of Maidanek and Oswiecim, from fascist slavery.

Was it the Soviet Union that made Hiroshima and Nagasaki the Pompeii of our day? The culprits, as you know, came from quite another part of the world.

Let us see what the world looks like today. It is covered with a rash of war bases. Whose bases are they? All of you know that they were established by the United States and its allies.

Take war propaganda. Where is it conducted? From whence do the calls come to shower atom bombs on a country, to destroy half its population and three-quarters of its industrial potential "in 24 hours"? General Nathan Twining and Congressman Olin Teague, who sounded those calls, are not citizens of any of the socialist countries. In the countries of the socialist commonwealth, where war propaganda has been outlawed, people of that sort would have been prosecuted in a court of law.

It was a cherished dream of Lenin, the founder of the Soviet state, that war would become impossible. He described world war as the greatest of crimes, a break from the accomplishments of modern civilisation and culture. He warned that using formidable technical advances for the mass annihilation of millions of human lives, and the conversion of all produc-

tive forces to war needs, inevitably "undermine the very conditions for the existence of human society" [*Works, 4th Russian Ed., Vol. 27, P.386*]. The socialist countries warn the world of this danger and work hard to avert it. This is the positive truth about the standpoint of the socialist countries, the standpoint of the communists.

Our Soviet state was born with Lenin's well-known Decree on Peace. Lenin rejected most vigorously the suggestion that the sword should be depicted on the Soviet coat-of-arms. "The sword is not an emblem for us," he said. It was the hammer and sickle that became the emblem of the Soviet land—a symbol of peaceful and constructive labour. We have stood, we stand today and will always stand upon Lenin's principles of peaceful co-existence. **That is the only doctrine of relations between states with different social systems that accords with the historical conditions of our age, the only doctrine on the basis of which peace can be preserved.** No matter what people may think about the way of life in the countries of the other social system, the world is whole and indivisible in face of the threat of nuclear disaster. In this, we are all of us the human race.

Many people in the West ask ever more frequently, "Does mankind have a future?" I would like to reply to them: Yes it has, and it is going to be a radiant future. We believe that mankind has grown equal to the task of bridling the atomic maniacs.

In this age of nuclear weapons, this age of rockets, the danger of a deadly nuclear war cannot be eliminated, unless the means of mass annihilation are destroyed and nuclear weapons prohibited. We are in favour of the complete destruction of the material means of warfare.

The "policy of strength", of "brinkmanship" and "atomic intimidation", would be impossible in the international relations of a disarmed world. The slogan of general and complete disarmament is equivalent to the slogan: "Down with wars between nations, and long live peace!"

That is why the struggle for general and complete disarmament is becoming the prime duty of the peace forces, of all the organisations and trends, national and international, advocating the maintenance and promotion of peace. Disarmament is an imperative demand of our times.

2. The Soviet Disarmament Programme

Dear delegates, the Soviet government is firmly and consistently carrying out a policy of promoting peace and peaceful co-existence. In putting forward its programme for general and complete disarmament, the Soviet government was prompted by the need for a radical solution to the problem of security for all nations through getting rid of the very possibility of war.

What is the main point of our programme? **The pivot and core of disarmament is the banning and complete destruction of nuclear weapons.**

The Soviet government proposes at least the immobilising of all nuclear weapons, paralysing them by destroying all means of delivering them, from the outset, from the very first stage of disarmament. We propose abolishing at one stroke the rockets, aircraft, surface warships and submarines that can

carry nuclear weapons, atomic artillery installations and all military bases on foreign soil; and the withdrawal of all foreign troops from the relevant countries.

Without rockets, aircraft, surface warships or submarines, nuclear arms would no longer be dangerous, even if an unscrupulous government stowed some of them away. The destruction of all means of delivery would make it impossible for any country possessing atomic weapons to strike a nuclear blow at other countries. A proposal to this effect was made at one time by the President of France, General de Gaulle, and we fully supported it. Unfortunately, the French government took no effective steps to further its own proposal. And what is more, it refused to take part in the disarmament negotiations in Geneva.

It is said that nuclear weapons can also be carried in TU-114s, Boeing 707s and other civil aircraft. But if there is a real desire for disarmament, the various countries may for a while keep their means of defence—anti-aircraft artillery, and air defence rockets and fighters. Modern means of warfare make it possible to shoot down any aircraft flying at any altitude. As you see, the argument is thoroughly untenable.

By proposing that disarmament be begun with the abolition of all vehicles for the delivery of nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union, which has the world's most powerful global and intercontinental missiles, is relinquishing of its own free will a most important military advantage. We are ready to take this step because we believe that it would expedite the solution of the disarmament problem.

For our part, we insist that the western powers should agree to abolish all their military bases on foreign soil and withdraw their troops from foreign countries. Those bases have been set up for aggression and not for defence. It must be obvious to anyone that, say, the U.S. rocket and nuclear bases on the Japanese island of Okinawa or in Libya, on African soil, or the U.S. bases in Britain, Italy, Turkey, Greece and Thailand are not needed for the defence of the United States. Whoever denies this is trying to pass black off as white.

Judge Douglas, a member of the U.S. Supreme Court, makes a revealing admission on this subject. The United States had ringed Russia with airfields, where American bombers and fighter planes were in combat readiness round the clock, he wrote in his book. The American bases included Morocco, where for a number of years U.S. bombers carrying atom bombs patrolled the skies day and night, ready to head for set targets on receipt of a coded signal. This is added proof that the threat of a new world war will persist as long as those bases exist.

In order greatly to reduce the danger of armed conflict between countries, the Soviet Union also proposes that at the very beginning of disarmament the numerical strength of the national armed forces be substantially cut and conventional armaments reduced accordingly. We think it possible to carry disarmament through to the end in four years. This is a short but quite sufficient time limit.

We are willing to seek and find mutually acceptable formulas for all the

provisions of our draft treaty, and to compromise wherever necessary—that is to say, of course, if this does not harm the cause of general and complete disarmament. The only thing we are not willing to do is to renounce general and complete disarmament, to emasculate our draft treaty and to strip it of all real disarmament measures. That is something to which we shall never agree.

We are for disarmament and not for talk about disarmament. A situation in which the arms race is growing in intensity even as disarmament negotiations continue, can no longer be tolerated. According to estimates made by the *U.S. News and World Report*, the 17 years from 1946 to 1962 have seen 863 international disarmament meetings, which took 17,000 hours to hold and at which 18 million words were uttered. While millions of words about disarmament become so much useless slag of history, arms production is increasing. Certain western circles are turning the disarmament negotiations into a talking shop in order to be able to maintain, behind a smokescreen of verbiage about disarmament, favourable conditions for war business and continue to pile up armaments.

The western powers' behaviour at Geneva indicates that they do not want any disarmament. The speeches made by the delegates of the United States and its allies at Geneva are purely perfunctory and declaratory. Those delegates pretend that their negative stand is acceptable and then represent us as opponents of agreement. But let us take a look into the United States proposals.

You will recall that after a long delay the United States finally submitted "an outline of basic provisions of a treaty" on disarmament. That outline shows that the U.S. attitude on general and complete disarmament remains essentially negative, although as far as secondary points and form are concerned, that attitude has now been varnished to some extent and contains many words about disarmament.

In reality, however, the "basic provisions" do not envisage what is precisely the basic thing, namely, a complete ban on nuclear weapons, the destruction of all stockpiles made by the countries, and the abolition of military bases on foreign soil. To agree to this sort of "disarmament" would mean deceiving the peoples and harming the cause of peace.

No sooner had the negotiations begun than the United States and its partners again attempted, as in the past, to shift all attention from disarmament questions to the much-advertised problem of international control, alleging that control was the crux of the disarmament problem.

As regards the meaning of the United States proposal for control, it is the same old demand for control without disarmament, slightly refurbished.

True, this time it is presented more subtly than it was before, but its meaning is the same—it is designed to set up a legalised system of international espionage for the benefit of a potential aggressor. Speaking about this kind of "novelty", Russian people say: "It's the same broth, but a bit thinner."

Our position is simple and easy to understand. We are in favour of completely abolishing the various kinds of armaments, one after another.

Furthermore, every step towards general and complete disarmament envisaged in our draft treaty is invariably accompanied by measures for strict international control.

But we are against establishing control over the armaments that will remain. Control over the remaining weapons is bound to be espionage, an attempt to ascertain whether the balance of forces has changed as a result of the cut in armaments and whether it is not possible to use eventual changes for launching an attack. No self-respecting country can accept such control.

The western powers are seeking all-inclusive control, while proposing very limited disarmament measures. The United States proposes that disarmament be begun with a 30 per cent reduction of the means of delivering nuclear weapons and certain conventional armaments.

Yet the question arises of whether the actual threat of war would be eased by this. No, it would not, because a huge thermonuclear potential would be retained. Mr. Nehru, the esteemed Prime Minister of India, is perfectly right in declaring that "Disarmament is no longer a question of reduction of armaments. A quarter of the nuclear arsenal of the big powers is enough to wipe out the whole world."

Furthermore, the United States, which proposes a 30 per cent reduction in the number of intercontinental ballistic missiles and global missiles in the first stage, wants to keep the existing network of military bases. The United States virtually fails to provide for the abolition of military bases on foreign territory and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the countries concerned, even in the third stage of disarmament. Does the U.S. government really imagine that the Soviet Union would agree to a 30 per cent cut in the first stage, and to another 35 per cent cut in the second stage, in its most developed, most powerful combat missiles while the U.S. military bases, so situated as to be able to strike at our territory, remained absolutely intact? We are not our own enemies and shall never agree to that sort of disarmament, if we may call it that.

And lastly, with this approach to the matter, United States acceptance of partial disarmament looks like a stratagem intended to discover all the arsenals of our national security, that is to say, to throw open the doors to a reconnaissance and espionage system and thus make things easier for the potential aggressor. The so-called inspection by zones envisaged by the U.S. "outline" also pursues an obvious aim, which is to establish the exact location of Soviet rocket and nuclear installations. In this case we may say, paraphrasing an American expression, that the reconnaissance tail wags the policy dog.

All difficulties over the issue of control arise from the fact that the western powers virtually dissociate it from the fulfilment of the decisive task, that is to say, real disarmament. We call on the western powers once again to accept our proposals for general and complete disarmament, and then we will accept any control measures they may propose.

The U.S. government suggests that large international armed forces be established and insists on them being equipped with nuclear weapons. It

regards the so-called "United Nations troops" in the Congo as a model of such forces. It is legitimate to ask, as we have already done on more than one occasion: Who will command those armed forces? Who will give the orders? The United States says the United Nations will. But what would this imply in practice? The U.N. machinery in its present form is dominated by the very powers that govern N.A.T.O., as events in the Congo have clearly shown. In these circumstances, to accept the U.S. proposal would mean choosing suicide, disarming ourselves and enabling N.A.T.O. to use the international armed forces for the purpose of dictating its will to us.

The only reasonable solution to the problem is to provide equal opportunities for control of the international forces. Today there are three groups of countries represented in the United Nations, and each group should enjoy the same rights and opportunities as the other two.

Is it normal that, because of U.S. resistance, the Chinese People's Republic has not to this day assumed its lawful seat in the United Nations?

Only on condition that all the groups of states are equal, will there be no abuses of the international armed forces to the detriment of any one of the groups of countries. It stands to reason that placing nuclear weapons at the disposal of the international armed forces is out of the question. It would be equivalent to mocking the peoples, who insist on being delivered for ever from the horrors of a nuclear war.

The United States also suggests empowering the International Court, which has no right of veto, to adopt decisions binding on countries, including decisions on peace and security issues. This proposal, which in reality undermines the U.N. Charter and nullifies the role of the Security Council as the chief agency for the maintenance of international peace and security, aims at infringing Soviet interests and replacing U.N.O. by a new international political system, in which the western powers expect to occupy a dominant position. Can we accept such a thing? Of course not! These proposals are aimed at undermining, not promoting peace.

The U.S.A. persists in its refusal to specify a general time limit for the carrying out of general and complete disarmament measures, although it now gives time limits for the first two stages. The provisions of the U.S.A.'s outline have been so worded that they enable the western powers to stall indefinitely on disarmament and, indeed, to defeat it if, at a particular moment, they come to the conclusion that strategically it is to their advantage to do so.

Lastly, I cannot withhold mention of the fact that—as is becoming increasingly evident at Geneva—the U.S.A. doesn't at all want to conclude a general and complete disarmament treaty, that would oblige countries to scrap their war machinery within a strictly defined period of time. U.S. government spokesmen tell our delegates at Geneva plainly that the U.S. government would never sign, nor Congress ratify, a general and complete disarmament treaty. It follows that the U.S.A. is merely talking about disarmament while actually taking a stand against it.

The Soviet Union is prepared to take into account, as it has done in the past, all proposals by the western powers that do not conflict with the solu-

tion of the problem of general and complete disarmament. But such suggestions are still very few.

We are prepared to consider carefully any proposal from our partners in negotiations, to seek for and find mutually acceptable ways of advancing the working out of a disarmament treaty. We are prepared to do our utmost for the success of the work of the 18-nation committee in Geneva, so that our collective efforts result in an effective programme for disarmament.

World opinion favours the conclusion of a disarmament treaty, and offers advice as to how to surmount the differences. The message to this congress from the philosopher Bertrand Russell is noteworthy in that respect.

Lord Russell says:

"I should like all negotiators from the West to state: 'I am firmly convinced that a nuclear war would be worse than the worldwide victory of communism.' I should like every negotiator from the East to declare: 'I am firmly convinced that a nuclear war would be worse than a worldwide victory of capitalism.'"

"Those on either side who refuse to make such a declaration would brand themselves as enemies of mankind and advocates of the extinction of the human race."

We, spokesmen of the socialist world, have never said that we were prepared to launch a thermonuclear war for the sake of communist victory throughout the world. Our leader, Lenin, proclaimed the policy of the peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems back in the early years of our revolution, and stated that the struggle against the capitalist system should be transferred to the sphere of economic competition. We stand squarely upon those Leninist principles.

We do not interpret Earl Russell's message as an appeal for an ultimatum: either war and atomic death or recognition of communism; and, vice-versa, either nuclear war or the recognition of capitalism. We believe that if either side works for the victory of its ideology and policy by augmenting its armed forces and its threats of war, things will surely move towards a worldwide nuclear war. **We declare to the whole world that the policy of starting a world war in order that the communist ideology should win is foreign to us.**

We base ourselves on the fact that there are two systems in the world—one system of states based on capitalist principles and another based on the Marxist-Leninist doctrine and on socialist principles. An ideological and political struggle is in progress between these two systems. We believe that this struggle should not be developed into a war between states with different social systems, but that matters should be settled through peaceful competition. Let every country of the socialist and the capitalist world prove the advantages of its system by peaceful endeavour.

The main criteria are: which system, the capitalist or the socialist, provides the masses of the people with the greater material and spiritual blessings, the higher living and cultural standards? Which of them provides genuine freedom for the individual, and ensures the rapid development of

the productive forces, culture and science in the interests of man, in the interests of the people?

We believe that to be the basis on which to settle the debate about whose system, whose views, are progressive, and which system really serves the interests of the masses of the people. The system that proves its advantages will win men's minds.

The programme of general and complete disarmament put forward by the Soviet government is very striking and strong proof of our desire to settle controversial issues through peaceful competition, not by war. It also shows that we are confident of winning a peaceful competition with capitalism.

Those, on the other hand, who oppose disarmament and say that war between the capitalist and socialist countries is inevitable, lack confidence in the strength of capitalism and its victory in peaceful competition with socialism.

This is why they clutch at nuclear war as at a chance of deliverance. Spokesmen of western ruling circles say, for all to hear, that atomic death is better than the victory of communism.

Signor Pella, for example, a former Foreign Minister of Italy, said: "Italy would rather run the risk of a Soviet atomic attack than fall under communist domination." Lord Birdwood said in the House of Lords on February 11, 1959: "I would rather prefer destruction, to life in a communist world." Rodney Gilbert, an American author, said in his book, *Competitive Co-existence—the New Soviet Challenge*: "Peace without a victory over communism be damned!"

Even one right-wing Labour leader, Donnelly, exhorts: "Better dead than red."

Those are very dangerous things to say. They show that some western spokesmen want to move competition from the economic sphere—the sphere in which the advantages of one system over another are tested by history—into the sphere of war. This means that many of the defenders of imperialism have lost confidence in capitalism's ability to win a competition with socialism, and are prepared to start a destructive world war, to bring death to millions upon millions of people, for the sake of preserving capitalism.

We communists are confident in the strength of socialism, in its advantages. It is a thing history has already proved. Socialism has in a short time demonstrated its viability, its supremacy in rates of economic development, in scientific and technological progress, education and the provision of true freedoms to the masses of the people.

The heights which the Soviet Union has now scaled provide impressive evidence of the advantages of socialism. We are not afraid of competing with capitalism. Let capitalism, as Earl Russell suggests, also abandon the idea of war and move its debate with socialism into the plane of peaceful competition.

The great significance of our stand lies in the fact that we transfer solution of the main controversial question of our time, that of which system is the better—it is in this controversy that many representatives of western ruling circles find the chief reason for the inevitability of armed conflicts—

from the military sphere into that of peaceful competition between countries with different social systems. Thereby the possibility is created of saving mankind from thermonuclear war.

Peace can be safeguarded fundamentally through the complete abolition of the physical machinery of war. In moving towards this goal, the Soviet government does not rule out but, on the contrary, considers essential agreement on the adoption of a series of steps to ease international tension, to strengthen confidence among countries and considerably to facilitate general and complete disarmament. Among such measures we include the establishment of nuclear-free zones in various areas, renunciation of the further spread of nuclear weapons, the withdrawal of troops from foreign territories, the prohibition of war propaganda and the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between N.A.T.O. and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation.

We have made numerous attempts to reach agreement with the western powers on a limited disarmament programme but have invariably come up against a refusal.

Take the disarmament proposals we presented to the western powers in 1955. Those were not proposals for general and complete disarmament—they only called for a reduction of the armed forces of the Soviet Union and the United States to 1,500,000 men. Nor was this figure at all accidental, for the western powers had themselves named it in the course of the talks then in progress. Yet what happened? As soon as we had agreed to the contingent of 1,500,000 men for the U.S.S.R. and the United States, our partners in the talks called it off and turned down our proposal.

In 1957 the Soviet government proposed an agreement on at least partial measures of disarmament.

Among these measures we included, this time as well, the western powers' own proposal for establishing aerial photography zones with a view to discovering secret preparations for aggression. You may remember that aerial photography at that time was a pet idea of President Eisenhower. We proposed establishing one aerial photography zone in Europe, 800 kilometres* deep on either side of the demarcation line between the armed forces of N.A.T.O. and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation. The zone was to have included the territories of the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Czechoslovakia and a sizeable strip of Soviet territory. The other zone was to have covered our Far East all the way to Lake Baikal, and an equal part of United States territory. In the same period we proposed the setting-up of control posts at railway junctions, in harbours and on motor highways to prevent surprise attack. In this case, too, we took western suggestions into consideration.

And what was the outcome? What was the lot that befell our proposals for aerial photography zones and control posts? They were rejected by the United States and the other N.A.T.O. powers, which is regrettable, for anyone will realise that had we at that time succeeded in reaching agreement on the lines suggested by us, the war danger would now be far less. But now that rockets have become our principal means of defence and N.A.T.O.

* 500 miles.

generals would readily sell their souls to the Devil if only they could find out the location of those defences, the measures can no longer be carried out in the absence of general and complete disarmament.

The Soviet government has approached the disarmament problem from different angles. For a number of years we proposed, for example, that agreement be reached on the withdrawal of foreign troops from German territory or, to begin with, on the reduction of those troops by one-third, our aim being an easing of tension in Europe, where the armed forces of the two groupings of countries are in direct contact. But this Soviet proposal, too, was left hanging in the air because of the western powers' negative attitude.

Unfortunately the western powers do not want any agreement on questions of disarmament. Their negative attitude is particularly manifest in their refusal to come to terms on the discontinuance of all tests of atom and hydrogen weapons.

It is true that nuclear tests are not the same as nuclear war. Yet their after-effects are very serious for mankind even now. The new and major series of nuclear tests which the U.S. government is carrying out jointly with the British government is a challenge to mankind. Matters have reached a point where the United States is testing nuclear weapons in space, even though the effect of the tests on people's living conditions may prove very dangerous.

President Kennedy said: "There is no health hazard here in this country, nor will there be from our tests." Mr. Kennedy did not tell the truth to the people of his country. Present-day scientific data say that the U.S. tests are doing immense harm to people's health. Besides, the earth is inhabited not only by the Americans but also by the British, Russian, Chinese, Japanese, French, Italian and other peoples. Yet those who are carrying on the tests do not even see fit to think of them and of the harm they are doing to the health of these peoples.

It should be clear to everyone that by carrying out the new, and largest, series of nuclear weapon tests, the United States and its allies want to secure military advantages for themselves and to intensify their aggressive policies. They have been doggedly pursuing these policies, which endanger peace, for many long years. You will recall that in 1958 the Soviet Union stopped its nuclear weapon tests by unilateral action. But what did the United States, Britain and France do? They stepped up the arms race. France began to test her atom bombs. The aggressive N.A.T.O. bloc began openly to threaten us with war over a German peace treaty. In those conditions the Soviet Union was compelled to take steps to perfect its thermonuclear weapons so as to cool certain hotheads who suggested wiping out Russia "with one blow".

We would have committed a crime against our people and all mankind had we not prevented the dangerous developments of last summer. Anyone who follows world developments knows that the Soviet Union's rocket and nuclear strength is the decisive factor in preserving peace and has, on more than one occasion, saved mankind from a world war which the imperialist

circles of the West were trying to start. Today, when the militarists in western countries are intensifying their aggressive policies, we cannot fail to take steps to strengthen the defences of the Soviet Union and the socialist community in general.

By increasing its strength, the Soviet Union is promoting not only its own interests, but also those of all mankind, and is contributing to the preservation of world peace. Yet we are by no means happy that we have to expend so much effort and so many resources on the production of modern weapons. Our scientists and technicians could find a much better use for their knowledge and experience. The improvement of weapons is an unavoidable necessity for the socialist countries. It would be much better if all weapons were dumped in the sea. We stand for general and complete disarmament. We are ready to sign an agreement with all the nuclear powers to ban all tests of these weapons. This would be a big step towards general disarmament. But nobody will live to see the socialist countries disarm unilaterally.

The "atomic djinn" which has broken loose would long since have been driven back into the bottle but for western resistance. Control over the discontinuance of the tests is no longer a problem. The present state of science makes it possible to detect all nuclear explosions by means of national systems, without any particular difficulty. An agreement banning nuclear weapon tests would have been reached long ago had the western powers shown, in the course of negotiations, even a fraction of the goodwill shown by the Soviet Union.

Last spring the U.S. government sent three delegations abroad. One of them went to Geneva, another to the session of the N.A.T.O. Council in Athens and the third, the most numerous, to the area of the Christmas and Johnston Islands to supervise nuclear tests.

The activity of which of the three delegations reflects with the greatest clarity the essence of United States policy? Everything indicates that it is the activity of the second and third. As for the Geneva delegation, it is a sort of cover. A very short time ago, on June 16, United States Secretary of Defence, McNamara, said:

"But we cannot hope to move towards our objective unless we move from strength."

The explosions over Christmas Island are part of the implementation of that policy. They strike at the hopes of the peoples. Yet they can neither weaken nor shake our will to fight for disarmament and for the discontinuation of nuclear explosions, everywhere and for all time. History itself demands ever more imperatively that all weapons and means of warfare be abolished.

Dear delegates, permit me now to say a few words about the German question. This question has no direct bearing on disarmament but it is closely linked with it. A peaceful settlement with Germany and the normalisation, on this basis, of the situation in West Berlin would ease international tension, and would also provide a sound groundwork for furthering the cause

of disarmament. This is being realised to an increasing extent by many statesmen.

Indeed, those who are striving for peace cannot but feel seriously alarmed, since the hotbed of the war danger in the heart of Europe is becoming ever more ominous. German militarism and revenge-seeking, which has brought the peoples incredible suffering, has once again been nurtured in West Germany by the United States monopolies, and is embarking more and more openly on a policy of aggression and adventure. Although Chancellor Adenauer poses as an opponent of the Hitler regime, he has the backing of Hitler generals and officers, and is in effect pursuing a Hitler policy. Here are the facts.

During his term in office Adenauer has spent more on West German armaments than Hitler spent on preparations for the Second World War. Hitler's military expenditure from 1933 to 1939 amounted to 90,000 million marks, while that of Chancellor Adenauer between 1950 and 1961 alone amounted to 100,000 million marks. Peace-loving mankind cannot but stop to think of these figures, for they are figures of death and suffering for the people. Hitler generals have been entrusted with the command of the N.A.T.O. ground forces in Europe. Certain European countries are beginning to march to the drumbeat of the Bonn revenge-seekers, and even the great powers are beginning to dance in time with it.

The West German militarists fiercely resist disarmament and a relaxation of international tension. In 1874 Moltke, an ideologist of German militarism, said cynically: "Everlasting peace is a dream and, moreover, an ugly one." Many changes have come about in the world since then. Yet the cannibal ideology of German militarism is unchanged. Defence Minister Strauss resists all disarmament plans with might and main. The Bonn militarists are reaching out for the atom bomb, and are already close to getting it, as the Athens session of the N.A.T.O. Council showed.

Bonn makes no secret of its plans for a forcible revision of the results of the last war, for a revision of the German frontiers established under the Potsdam agreements. The Bonn Minister Seehofer says: "Czechoslovakia, Poland and the Soviet Union should not entertain the hope that we have renounced the territories beyond the Oder and Neisse." He is backed up by Von Hassel, Minister-President of Schleswig Holstein, who says: "Our territorial claims reach far beyond the Oder-Neisse line. We want to regain the old regions of German domination."

Some revenge-seeking politicians, including Herr Brandt, even take the liberty of threatening the socialist countries.

From these threats and from what the Bonn politicians are doing, one might doubt whether they were living in 1962 or whether the hands of their watches had stopped at the time of Hitler's campaigns of conquest.

What the Soviet Union advocates is to write *finis* to the Second World War, conclude a peace treaty with the two German states and on this basis normalise the situation in West Berlin, which is fraught with the danger of an explosion.

This is evidently the only possible and sensible attitude to take. Yet the

United States, British and French governments are against the conclusion of a German peace treaty. They are trying to perpetuate the occupation regime in West Berlin and keep their troops there. But how can one be reconciled to the fact that in the centre of Europe there is a powder keg with a burning fuse? How can this fact accord with the interests of the people of West Berlin or any country?

It only accords with the aims of the manufacturers of lethal weapons and the West German revenge-seekers. Strictly speaking, the western statesmen on whom agreement on the conclusion of a peace treaty depends, are aware of this, and the only reason why they don't conclude a treaty is that they do not want to hurt the feelings of Chancellor Adenauer, their ally. Western Germany and its armed forces are already becoming the backbone of the aggressive forces of N.A.T.O. and are shaping the policies of that bloc to an increasing extent. As for those who believe themselves to be the leaders, they are conniving with the West German revenge-seekers on the plea that western unity must not be impaired. Under the guise of preserving western unity, that is to say, N.A.T.O. unity, they are taking their cue from the aggressive forces in Western Germany.

One must not overlook yet another circumstance. The present occupation of West Berlin has long since ceased to be the occupation that was implied at the time when the allies signed their quadrilateral agreements following the defeat of Hitler Germany. Those agreements were aimed at abolishing German militarism and nazism and preventing the threat of a new war on the part of Germany. But occupied West Berlin today is a special kind of N.A.T.O. military base where the troops of the powers in that aggressive bloc are stationed, a base directed against former allies—the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia and a number of other countries which fought against Hitler Germany.

We want West Berlin, an independent political unit, to be given the most reliable international guarantees; we want its people to be granted the right freely to shape their own way of life. The western powers, however, are concerned with the maintenance of their military base in West Berlin and not with the fate of the population of that city.

The Soviet government has taken a number of steps to bring about mutually acceptable decisions, and has agreed to the occupation forces in West Berlin being replaced on certain conditions by United Nations or neutral troops. As no agreement has been reached on this matter, we suggest that the troops to be stationed in West Berlin should be those of Norway and Denmark, or of Belgium and the Netherlands, as well as those of Poland and Czechoslovakia. Needless to say, those troops should be under the United Nations flag, and should not represent either of the existing military groupings.

Time presses! If the western powers persist in their refusal to contribute to the elimination of the survivals of the Second World War, the socialist countries, as well as other peaceloving countries, will have no choice but to conclude a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic, with all the consequences it may entail.

The example of Laos shows that, given a desire for agreement, ways can be found of settling the most challenging and complicated international problems. Removal of the vestiges of the Second World War is vital to peace, and the solution of this problem brooks no further delay. Disarmament, the exclusion of war from the life of society and the establishment of a lasting peace on earth constitute one of the cherished goals of the Soviet people and their government.

As long ago as the last century Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, the eminent author of *The Song of Hiawatha*, called "the tribes of men together", saying:

"Bury your war-clubs and your weapons. . . .

Smoke the calumet together."

I do not smoke but, really, I would be happy to light the calumet together with the leaders of all the powers!

3. A World Without Armaments Would be a Great Blessing for All Mankind

Martin Andersen Nexö, an outstanding representative of world culture, said that people needed peace "to work, to rejoice and to make life beautiful". Disarmament and peace could open up truly inexhaustible wellsprings of creative endeavour, which today are being blocked by the militarists. The huge resources thrown into the maw of war preparations could be switched to meet the pressing needs of mankind, which are so numerous.

The disarmament problem has lately drawn the attention of increasingly wide sections of the population in the West, including the United States. In a number of cases scientists are giving a sober analysis of the eventual social and economic effects of general disarmament.

The conclusions arrived at by a team of experts who recently, on instructions from the United Nations, prepared a report on the economic and social consequences of disarmament, are worthy of note. The report stresses that disarmament would produce beneficial results and lead to an improvement in the condition of the peoples of all countries. If the governments proceed with determination to switch funds from military to peaceful uses, the report points out, "no country need fear a lack of useful employment opportunities for the resources that would become available to it through disarmament".

Yet the ideologists of the armaments business, particularly in the United States, are really hammering it into the minds of people that the enormous national expenditure on armaments is a means of achieving "economic prosperity", while disarmament would bring nothing but economic dislocation and increased unemployment. Isn't this a disgusting and monstrous idea which makes the possibility of economic progress, of employment and a guaranteed livelihood conditional on the mass production of means of destruction?

Experience gives the lie to the economic arguments of the opponents of disarmament. Growing military expenditure can only produce a short-lived, unhealthy expansion of industrial production, and in the final analysis it

leads to economic stagnation and mass unemployment. In fact, which are the capitalist countries where expenditure on armaments has assumed the greatest scale in recent years? They are first of all the United States and Britain. And which are the capitalist countries where the rate of industrial growth has been the lowest during the same period? The United States and Britain.

The militarists and monopolists, who are making unprecedented profits from the production of armaments, are intimidating the masses of the people, saying that in the event of disarmament millions of people would find themselves out of jobs and an "economic disaster" would set in. This point of view is without foundation. On the contrary, disarmament would bring real economic benefits to all sections of the population in the capitalist countries, and above all to the working class, the peasantry and the middle sections of the urban population, whom it would relieve of the backbreaking burden of taxation.

Manufacturers, scientists, workers and engineers, whose wellbeing today depends on the arms race, on the sinister "business of death", would do well to recall *Mother Courage and Her Children*, that excellent play by Bertolt Brecht, the German anti-fascist writer. The play presents the tragic portrait of a sutler who lives on war but whom war robs of her children, one after another, and thus drains her life of meaning and purpose!

In this same way, war preparations which today are rewarded with seeming and fleeting benefits, will tomorrow demand a heavy tribute in the lives, health and future of children and grandchildren.

It is true that disarmament alone will not solve all social problems. But stopping the insane waste of forces and resources on means of destruction, and switching these resources to peaceful purposes, will undoubtedly benefit the economies of all countries. Even in such a rich capitalist country as the United States, millions of people are badly in need of housing, hospitals and schools. Even the U.S. President says that there are too many illiterate and uneducated people in the United States and that, at the same time, the country is short of more than 127,000 classrooms.

There are no funds to build schools and hospitals and improve the living standards of the people. Yet thousands of millions of dollars are being spent on means of destruction. Disarmament would make it possible to allocate funds for meeting the urgent needs of the American people. American economists estimate that the U.S. government could, within the first five years following disarmament, spend 330,000 million dollars. Some 160,000 million would have to be spent on clearing the slums, on housing and the water supply; 30,000 million on the building of schools and education; 35,000 million on health and hospitals, and 105,000 million on road-building and for other purposes. These figures smash the myth which says that in the event of disarmament there would be nothing to make up for the so-called national war market.

Disarmament would benefit the entire western economy. The only losers would be a small handful of armaments manufacturers, who would be deprived of the possibility of plundering the peoples through supplies of

armaments. The sooner they are deprived of this possibility, the more the people will gain. But even the arms manufacturers could, if they are still human at all, reconvert their plants to the production of means of satisfying the requirements of people instead of means of exterminating people.

Disarmament would also bring tremendous advantages to the underdeveloped countries which are beginning to carry out vast projects for national revival, and to the peoples fighting for their liberation from colonial tyranny.

The liberation of peoples from the chains of colonial slavery is a great and progressive development. The Soviet Union wholeheartedly supports the sacred, just struggle of the peoples against colonialism. The Soviet attitude is clear and precise. **There must be no people shackled with the chains of colonialism in Asia, Africa, Latin America or any other area of the globe. All peoples must be free.** There is a close interconnection between the struggle for national liberation and the struggle for disarmament and peace. The struggle for general disarmament facilitates the struggle for national independence. The achievements of the national liberation movement, in their turn, promote peace and contribute to the struggle for disarmament.

The colonialists have always established and maintained their rule by force of arms. Naturally, to deprive them of arms would mean pulling out the teeth of the colonialist sharks. It would forever eliminate the possibility of any colonialist revenge and would finally and irrevocably undermine the foundations of their rule in the colonies that still exist.

I would like to stress once again that the Soviet proposals for general and complete disarmament speak, above all else, of the need for destroying modern lethal weapons. As it happens, these weapons are not in the hands of those fighting against colonialism. Disarmament means disarming the forces of war, abolishing militarism, ruling out armed interference in the internal affairs of any country, and doing away completely and finally with all forms of colonialism.

That is why disarmament would make for a further development of the national liberation movement. Given a lasting peace, nothing could hamper the progress of the national liberation struggle of the peoples or prevent them from winning complete political and economic independence.

Today the underdeveloped countries are spending roughly between 5,000 and 6,000 million dollars a year for military purposes. This is a colossal amount for countries which need every single penny to break free from poverty and backwardness. There can be no doubt that, given peace and deliverance from the burden of military expenditure, the underdeveloped countries could all the sooner develop their economies and gain economic independence.

Disarmament would create proper conditions for a tremendous increase in the scale of assistance to the newly-established national states. If a mere 8 to 10 per cent of the 120,000 million dollars spent for military purposes throughout the world were turned to that purpose, it would be possible to end hunger, disease and illiteracy in the distressed areas of the globe within 20 years. A mere fifth of the amount spent for military purposes would be

sufficient to build 96 steel plants the size of the Bhilai works in India, which is to turn out 2,500,000 tons of steel a year, or 17 giants like the Aswan dam in the United Arab Republic.

This amount would be enough to set up from 30 to 40 power industry centres of world significance, such as powerful industrial combines in the valleys of the Nile, the Niger, Congo and Zambesi in Africa, in the Sahara, in the valleys of the great Indus, the Ganges and the Mekong in Asia, in the foothills of the Andes and on the banks of South American rivers.

It is needless to speak of the beneficial effect which these measures would have on the development of the young national states, of the powerful spur they would be to their industrialisation and progress. Those countries could within the next 20 to 25 years overcome their economic backwardness to a considerable extent and approach the industrial standards of countries like Britain and France.

Such an advance of the newly-established national states would undoubtedly require their close co-operation with the industrially-developed countries. The main condition for this co-operation is genuine equality and mutual benefit. This co-operation would result in expanded production and would provide many additional millions of people in all countries with jobs.

It has been estimated that with the funds spent for military purposes all over the world during the past ten years, an end could have been put to the housing shortage in all countries. Given general and complete disarmament, the wealth of the world could be more than doubled within 20 to 25 years.

Needless to say, the peoples of the Soviet Union and all socialist countries have a vital interest in disarmament. As has already been said, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have been compelled by the arms race to spend large sums on strengthening their defences. We could make proper use of the funds that would be released through disarmament to carry out peacetime projects for the happiness of men and women.

Last autumn the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union adopted its new programme in this hall. The programme envisages a titanic amount of work on creating material and spiritual values such as the age-long history of mankind has never known. Allow me to cite a few facts and figures to enable you to assess the magnitude of the tasks which the Soviet people have set themselves.

It is our intention that in 20 years the Soviet Union shall produce almost double the industrial output now produced by all of the non-socialist world. In 1980, for example, we shall produce up to three million million kilowatt-hours of electric power, or 50 per cent. more than the power produced by the capitalist world in 1961. We have set ourselves the magnificent task of building up an abundance of all blessings and of going over to the principle: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

The unprecedented scope of our building programmes speaks for itself. Even many of those who wish us ill now admit that people who draw up and execute plans of that kind must be vitally interested in lasting peace. We have set our sights far ahead; we are planning years and decades in

advance. Our plans and targets, this accelerating rhythm of our development that justifies our likening the immense body of socialist countries from the Elbe to the Pacific Ocean to a giant building site, leave no room for war.

The peace policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries springs directly from the nature of our society. It is part and parcel of our society. Our economic and social system has no "nutritive medium" for militarism, for a policy of conquest and for war business. We have no classes, groups or individuals yearning to seize foreign lands, foreign markets, or spheres of investment. We have no people who profit by government war orders. In our country no group will ever foment militarist hysteria, scaring the parliaments into increasing military allocations and taxes on the population. We have all the resources we need. All thoughts of revising frontiers, acquiring new territories, or subjugating other countries economically, are completely foreign to the Soviet Union.

The desire for peace is inherent in the very nature of the socialist countries, while aggressive designs against other peoples are foreign to it. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and all the other Communist Parties always appeal for friendship among the peoples, and not for attacks by one nation on another.

The class struggle in the capitalist countries, it is true, prevails, and it is inevitable, because it springs from the division of society into classes. The outcome of the class struggle, the choice of the way of life and of the system, is the domestic affair of the population of each country.

The communists of all countries, assembled at their meeting in 1960, adopted a peace manifesto in which they solemnly proclaimed that they considered the struggle for the preservation and promotion of peace a sacred duty.

Our constructive 20-year programme also defines the chief purpose of Soviet foreign policy. This purpose is to ensure a peaceful environment for the building of communist society in the Soviet Union and the development of the world socialist system, and to deliver mankind, in concert with all the peaceloving peoples, from a devastating worldwide war.

The great ideals of peace, labour, liberty, equality, fraternity and happiness for all nations are inscribed on our banner.

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin proclaimed disarmament as the socialist ideal.

As long ago as 1922, in Genoa, at the first international conference attended by the Soviet state, our country's spokesmen, on Lenin's instructions, proposed universal disarmament and the disbandment of standing armies.

This was the first proposal for general disarmament to come formally from a state in the history of mankind. And we are proud that it came from our socialist state, from its head of government, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin.

A big period of history lies between Genoa 1922 and Geneva 1962. Profound changes have occurred on our planet. But today, just as was the case 40 years ago, the Soviet standpoint on questions of disarmament is essentially the same.

We have always advocated disarmament and are applying all our efforts to reinforcing world peace. The most radical proposals on behalf of peace—the proposal that a German peace treaty be concluded, that nuclear tests be banned

and nuclear weapons totally eliminated, that atom-free zones be established, that armed forces be reduced, that a peace pact be concluded, that all controversial matters be settled by negotiation, and, last but not least, crowning them all, the draft treaty for general and complete disarmament—these have all come from the Soviet Union. We worked for peace and disarmament when we were still weak in the military sense. We are working for peace and disarmament now, when—let us be frank about it—we have the most perfect weapons which no other power possesses. Isn't this the best possible proof that the Soviet Union does not want war?

Between 1955 and 1958 we, on our own, unilaterally reduced our armed forces by 2,140,000 men. We gave up military bases. Could any country afford to reduce its armed forces to that extent if it were preparing for attack? Only a country that seeks peace can afford to do so. And we regret that the other countries negotiating disarmament with us have not followed suit. In 1960 the session of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet took a decision to reduce the strength of the Soviet armed forces by another third, or by 1,200,000 men. The Soviet Union had begun to put this decision into effect, but the unveiled western threat to go to war against the Soviet Union compelled us to suspend the demobilisation of soldiers and officers.

If the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries had not been threatened by the aggressive western forces, which are armed to the teeth, we would long since have disbanded our armies and converted our war industries to civilian production. In the last four years we have been spending an annual average of about 10,000 million new roubles on defence. It is easily seen how much faster our gigantic construction programme would proceed if these vast resources were put into peaceful development.

So long as the aggressive imperialist forces exist, we are compelled to produce powerful modern weapons, keep the necessary armed forces, and maintain the defences of the Soviet state at a level that ensures decisive and complete defeat of the aggressor. But we are ready to disarm at any moment, even tomorrow, if the capitalist countries do likewise.

General and complete disarmament would ring in a truly historic change in men's lives from the epoch of wars to the epoch of lasting peace on earth.

This historic change can come true. It must come true! Everything depends on the masses of the people, on their perseverance and determination.

4. The Peoples Can and Must Achieve Disarmament and Preserve Peace

Mankind can and must live without war. War in the present epoch is not fatally inevitable. But neither is peace fatally inevitable.

The question is whether the people today have the resources to stop the race towards death, towards a new war. We say unequivocally: Yes, they have. Today there are real and powerful forces, capable of safeguarding peace. They are the Soviet Union and the world socialist system, which present a powerful barrier to a new world war; the many young sovereign states favouring general disarmament and lasting peace, which include such great powers as India and

Indonesia; and the peaceloving forces in all countries, fighting for the elimination of the very possibility of armed conflicts.

The world peace movement, headed by the World Council of Peace, and the various other organisations of peace fighters, are making a big contribution to the noble cause of peace. Present at this congress are spokesmen of many new organisations which have joined in the battle for peace. This shows that the peace movement is expanding and gaining strength. The fight for peace waged by the finest sons of the people in the capitalist countries faces great difficulties. Reprisals are showered upon brave men and women who truly represent the conscience of mankind. But in spite of the hardships, they carry on their noble work perseveringly. And grateful mankind will never forget their efforts.

It is not to be expected, of course, that the militarists will want to disarm of their own accord. The warlike groups are desperately resisting disarmament, and will continue to do so. We must never forget that so long as the militarists, those makers of military thunderclaps, exist in Europe and America, the danger of war will persist. But there are forces in the world today capable of forcing them to disarm.

Great trials have fallen to the lot of our generation. Grave responsibilities rest on its shoulders. If we live up to them and check the aggressive forces, it will mean that we shall have wrought a safe future for mankind.

People who are conscious of the future and the happiness of their children will realise that, though much has been done in the past years to preserve and strengthen peace, much more still has to be done, a hundred and a thousand times more.

There are strong forces in the United States, Britain, Western Germany, France and other member-countries of the various aggressive blocs who are waging an effective struggle for lasting peace, for greater understanding among countries and nations, and for the great idea of general and complete disarmament. That is quite true. Many individuals belonging to the ruling classes take part in this struggle as well, because they see the present world situation in a sober and realistic light.

But, to speak frankly, many people in the western countries do not appreciate all the dangers of a nuclear war, and stay out of the active struggle for disarmament and peace. Many trade unions, large sections of the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia have not yet joined in the battle. Yet, shoulder to shoulder with the present champions of peace, they are capable of making the western ruling circles heed the will of the peoples. Quite a number of people are led astray by the slogans of parties that speak sweet words of peace, especially at election time, while in actual fact the governments composed of their members are carrying on the arms race. Yet these parties, which have had a hand in founding the aggressive N.A.T.O., S.E.A.T.O. and Cento blocs, get the electorates' approval over and over again to form governments.

The indisputable fact is, and herein lies the complexity of the present international situation, that the top leadership of the principal western bourgeois parties and many of the right-wing leaders of the social-democratic parties favour the arms race.

Take the United States. It has a Democratic and a Republican Party. There are disputes between them, though it is impossible for a person unversed in politics to understand what they are about, but in matters concerning war preparations the Republican elephant and the Democratic donkey are in one harness. It is the same in Western Germany: the party of war and revenge headed by Adenauer calls the tune, and the leadership of the Social-Democratic Party chimes in. In Britain, the right-wing Labour Party leadership falls in with the conservatives and gives active support to their war measures, in defiance of the will of the rank-and-file membership and the trade unions, on the cardinal issue of war and peace.

The picture is essentially the same as far as the French rulers are concerned. As for the other N.A.T.O., S.E.A.T.O. and Cento member-countries, they play what is, in actual fact, a secondary role and have no say to speak of in matters of war and peace. In Norway and Denmark the governments are headed by social-democrats. But instead of acting in accordance with the will of the working class and the rest of the working people, who do not want war, they fall in with the militarist forces, take part in the aggressive N.A.T.O. bloc, and help to work out arms race decisions.

In all frankness, there is a tremendous contrast between the will of the peoples, who appreciate the dangers of a new world war, and the fact that preparations for nuclear war are being stepped up in the western countries. The somewhat passive attitude to the peace struggle of many sections of the population there, and the fact that they under-rate their own possibilities, is playing into the hands of the war-makers.

General and complete disarmament is truly a great goal and calls for great actions and great efforts on the part of all the peoples. With a keen sense of the decisive nature and the gravity of the hour, we should like to declare from this rostrum to all men and women regardless of their social background and convictions, to the generation that has lived through the terrors of war and to the young people who know about war only by what their elders tell them:

This is the time to act ! For the sake of life on earth and the happiness of all men and women, for the sake of the future of mankind, show firmness and determination in demanding a ban on nuclear weapons and general disarmament !

If the people act, they can compel the preachers of war to retreat from the political arena, and make governments change their policy and the climate of international relations as a whole. But in order to do this, all the peoples' forces must act, act, and act again. That is the main thing.

It is especially the **workers**, who, with their families, comprise more than half the population in the developed capitalist countries, who can do much on behalf of peace. The many millions of the working class, the class of creators, to whom destruction is foreign, are destined by history to thwart the atom maniacs and to deliver mankind from the deadly peril that hangs over it.

The **peasants**, the second biggest section of the people's force, are also vitally interested in preventing a nuclear war. The time has come for the voice of the masses of peasants to resound against war throughout the world.

Can the **women**, who give life to new generations, fail to show a special, and,

I venture to say, unparalleled, activity in the struggle against the forces threatening to start a nuclear war? A war of that kind would turn the bright world of children into a world of orphans and cripples.

And the **young people**—doesn't the solution of the cardinal question of our time depend on them to a large extent? For the young, war means the frustration of all their hopes; it is ravished youth. Peace means breath-taking prospects for creation, the fulfilment of dreams, an increase in mankind's wealth and an advance in the exploration of the Universe.

I should like to say that the role of the **intellectuals**, the **scientists**, those magicians of spiritual culture and discoverers of more and more secrets of nature, has never been so important. It is good to see that many scientists and men and women of culture, aware of what modern lethal weapons mean for mankind, are sounding the alarm and calling on the peoples to bridle the forces of war before it is too late.

The great French scientist, Joliot-Curie, who served until his dying breath as an inspiring example of dedication to peace, will live in men's memories forever.

Can the scientists and technicians developing atom and hydrogen bombs, rockets, military planes, submarines and ships wash their hands of all responsibility if these tools of death are used to attack peace-loving countries? In the western countries, scientists, technicians and workers are developing unprecedentedly lethal weapons, while a handful of capitalist monopoly bosses control them.

It should go against the conscience and intelligence of scientists and technicians that the powerful weapons they have developed should be turned against civilisation, against the peoples, against themselves, against life on earth. The fundamental difference between the situation of scientists doing military work in the socialist and the imperialist countries is quite obvious. The Soviet scientists are working in a country that is fighting to banish war from the life of society. They are working for the sake of strengthening peace. But, like the rest of the Soviet people, they would prefer to give their strength and skill to building, and only building, in a world disarmed.

History also brings the businessmen in the capitalist countries face to face with the sharpest of questions. In past wars the death of millions of people yielded fabulous profits to members of the business world, but a modern war will yield them death instead of profits. Nuclear weapons draw no line between the rich and the poor. Only ultra-militarists on the brink of insanity, who are contemptuous of the fate of nations, hope they will sit it out in bomb shelters. There is no shelter from nuclear bombs. Anyone who wants to live must fight for disarmament.

The independent Asian, African and Latin American countries, usually described as non-aligned or neutralist, are beginning to play an increasingly important part in the great battle for peace. India, Indonesia, the United Arab Republic, Brazil, Ghana, Guinea, Ceylon, Burma, Afghanistan, Mali and many other countries are in favour of signing a treaty on general and complete disarmament.

There can be no neutrality on the question of general and complete disarmament.

ment and the prevention of nuclear war. If war breaks out, it will not only involve the belligerents; it will bring grave disasters to the populations of the neutralist countries. The neutralist countries should make their contribution to the solution of the all-important question of our day. They will make that contribution if their policy on questions of disarmament does not succumb to external political and economic pressure and is not influenced by mercantile and transient interests.

Dear delegates, the struggle for peace has brought together people of different classes and political convictions. The situation of impending storm calls for a truly worldwide alliance of the peoples against war, expressing the will of all social groups, all the nations of Europe, Asia, Africa, America and Oceania. There can be only one goal for the programme and the activities of this truly worldwide association of diverse peaceloving forces—to prevent a thermo-nuclear war and to isolate the bellicose maniacs.

Let me reassure the congress that the Soviet Union will continue to apply all its efforts on behalf of the great and noble cause of peace.

The Soviet Union is for peace and friendship among all nations. Our government has instructed me to declare from this rostrum that the Soviet people want to live in peace and friendship with the industrious and gifted people of America. The Soviet and American peoples have no grounds for hostility to each other. Peace and friendship are in their common interest. The Soviet people call on the American people, just as they do on all other peoples, to work together for these noble aims.

I should like to stress once again that the masses of the people, and their actions, are the decisive force in the battle for disarmament. May the worldwide movement for universal disarmament and peace expand every day and every week! May all the peoples rise, and with their actions achieve disarmament and block the road to world war!

The greater the army of peace supporters and the more active it is, the more rapidly will general and complete disarmament be accomplished. The people of every country will no doubt find effective forms and methods of struggle for universal disarmament and lasting peace, consistent with the specific local conditions, and thereby do their bit for the solution of this problem.

Over a hundred years ago Victor Hugo spoke at the Paris Congress of Friends of Peace, of a future day when guns would be exhibited in museums and people would wonder how such barbarism was possible in the past. "The day will come," Victor Hugo exclaimed, "when markets open to trade, and minds open to ideas will be the only battlefields."

"Peace, commerce and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none," was what that great American, Thomas Jefferson, wanted to see in the field of international relations of the future.

In the days of Hugo and Jefferson these appeals were a magnificent but impracticable dream. Today, when there is a powerful world socialist system throwing its weight on the scales of the peace struggle, when a large group of peaceful Asian, African and Latin American countries has emerged on the international arena, and when the working-class, general democratic, and

national liberation movements have developed into one of the decisive factors of our time, real conditions are arising to make the dreams of generations about peace come true at last.

Friends, the peoples are pinning far-reaching hopes on the work of this congress.

So may its summons be heard throughout the universe, inspiring new tens of millions of people to fight with determination and dedication for lasting peace on earth!

Once the various streams composing the movement against the threat of nuclear war merge into one common torrent, its force will be irresistible. It will surge over all the continents like the spring floods and will sweep the obstacles to general and complete disarmament out of the way.

Hail to the fighters for peace, for the prevention of a nuclear world war!

Long live lasting peace and friendship among all nations!

Thank you for your attention.