

- (4) To instruct the Foreign Ministers to take note of the proceedings in the Disarmament Commission, to take account of the views and proposals advanced by the heads of Government at this conference, and to consider whether the four Governments can take any further useful initiative in the field of disarmament.

(The Times, 25th July, 1955)

§

STATEMENTS, PROPOSALS and OFFICIAL DECISIONS

(c) AFTER THE GENEVA CONFERENCE

OF THE HEADS OF GOVERNMENT OF THE FOUR GREAT POWERS

Statement by Sir Anthony Eden on his return from the Geneva Conference.

Speaking to reporters on his return from Geneva on 24th July, Sir Anthony Eden said that President Eisenhower's proposal was very imaginative and one which quite rightly struck the people of the world with the sincerity of his feelings on the matter, "but there are other offers we have got to examine, and all these can now be taken up and pursued."

(The Times, 25th July, 1955).

§

Speech by Marshal Tito, President of the People's Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, at Karlovatz on 27th July, 1955.

...At present, it is just a question of modifying and finally coordinating, between East and West, the proposals made at the Geneva Conference. In May, the Soviet proposals on disarmament were published. They were also put forward at this Conference...

Speaking of the proposals made by President Eisenhower, Marshal Tito continued:

...I would like to say, in this connection, that certain elements abroad are trying to exploit this proposal for propoganda purposes against the Soviet Union. They want to stir things up and compromise the understanding achieved at Geneva. They assert that Eisenhower made a proposal about aerial photographs, while the Russians did not even want to reply to it, and that therefore this means the Russians do not want peace. This ill-intentioned propoganda is absurd. I am deeply convinced that it has nothing in common with what the Russians really want. I am sure that the Russians want peace no less than the Americans, no less than the English people, no less than the French people and all peoples of Europe, indeed of the rest of the world...

(Documentation Française,
Articles et Documents No.0,240 of
4th August, 1955).

§

Speech by Chou En-lai at the 30th July session of the Chinese National People's Congress.

(Mr. Chou En-lai, Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of China, made a statement on 30th July, 1955 at the 2nd Session of the Chinese National People's Congress, dealing with the international situation arising out of the Geneva Conference and the foreign policy of his country. Below is an extract).

...Reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons is a problem the solution of which the people of the world urgently demand. The draft resolution on reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons put forward by the Soviet Union at the conference of the heads of government of the Four Powers is a preliminary measure for the implementation of the Soviet proposals of 10th May, 1955 on the reduction of armaments, prohibition of atomic weapons and elimination of the threat of another war. The Chinese Government supports the Soviet proposals of 10th May. If a world conference on general disarmament and prohibition of atomic weapons as proposed by the Soviet Union is successfully convened, China will be ready, at that conference, to undertake obligations along with other countries. As a matter of fact, since the founding of the People's Republic of China, we have already demobilized more than 4,516,000 men, and the defence expenditure in our 1955 budget constitutes only 24.19 per cent of the total expenditure, which is a much smaller percentage compared with the huge military appropriations of the Western countries. However, at present a concrete solution of the question of general disarmament is not yet achieved, the threat of an atomic war is not yet eliminated, the chain of military bases and military blocs encircling our country is not yet removed. We cannot but take into account the possibility of being suddenly attacked. In these circumstances, we must remain vigilant and must strengthen our necessary national defence...

(People's China, 16th August, 1955)

§

Order of the Day No.125 issued by the Soviet Defence Minister on 31st July, 1955, on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Austria.

(After the Geneva Conference, as Marshal Bulganin had already indicated at the opening session of the Conference, the Soviet Government published an Order of the Day signed by Marshal Zhukov, Minister of Defence of the U.S.S.R., from which we give the following extract).

Faithful to its policy of strengthening peace and friendship between peoples, the Soviet Government has decided to reduce its military forces by the number of troops being withdrawn from Austria in accordance with the Austrian State Treaty. The step by the Soviet Government is new evidence of the peace policy of the U.S.S.R.

In accordance with the decision of the Government of the U.S.S.R., I order:

1. The withdrawal of all troops stationed in Austria to the territory of the Soviet Union before 1st October, 1955.
2. The reduction of the strength of the armed forces of the U.S.S.R. by the number of troops to be withdrawn from Austria.

In this connection, demobilisation of the corresponding number of soldiers. Demobilisation to take place according to the established procedure.

3. The Officers commanding military areas to consult with local government organs regarding employment for the servicemen and

employees to be demobilised in accordance with the present order...

(Pravda, 31st July, 1955).

§

Report by Marshal Bulganin at the 3rd session of the Supreme Soviet on 4th August, 1955.

(On 4th August, 1955, Marshal Bulganin gave a report on Geneva to the 3rd session of the 4th Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. Members of the diplomatic corps and correspondents of the Soviet and foreign press were present. The following paragraphs are from this report).

...U.S. direct military expenditure in the 1948-49 fiscal year was 12,900 million dollars, or 32.6 per cent of all Federal budget expenditure; in the 1953-54 fiscal year it rose to 46,500 million dollars, or 68.6 per cent of all Federal expenditure. Thus, since 1948, the U.S. military budget has increased more than three and a half times, while its proportion to total U.S. expenditure has more than doubled.

Britain's direct military expenditure in the 1948-49 fiscal year totalled £768,000,000, or 24.2 per cent of total budget expenditure; in 1953-54 it had already grown to £1,637,000,000 or 38.3 per cent of all budget expenditure.

French direct military expenditure in 1949 amounted to 289,000 million francs, or 23.8 per cent of all budget expenditure; in 1954 it had risen to 1,192,000 million francs, comprising 32.5 per cent of total budget expenditure.

Clearly, under such circumstances the Soviet Union could not but be concerned with strengthening its own armed forces. In 1955, military expenditure of 112,122,710,000 rubles is planned - which amounts to approximately 20 per cent of total budget expenditure...

At the Geneva Conference, President Eisenhower put forward a proposal for the organization of an exchange of military information between the Soviet Union and the United States of America and reciprocal aerial photography.

While giving due credit to the desire to achieve a solution of so complex a problem as that of international control contained in this proposal, it must at the same time be said that the practical effectiveness of such measures would be negligible.

In unofficial talks with the U.S. government leaders we stated that aerial photography could not produce the desired results, since both our countries cover a vast area in which anything could be hidden. It must also be borne in mind that the plan suggested concerns only the territory of the two countries in question, omitting armed forces and military installations stationed on the territory of other states...

(New Times, 11th August, 1955)

§

Statement by President Eisenhower at a Press Conference on 8th August, 1955.

Replying to a question on Marshal Bulganin's attitude to his proposals for a reciprocal aerial inspection of the military installations of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., President Eisenhower replied:

"...I believe his (Marshal Bulganin's) exact language was that he thought his proposal of 10th May with its provisions for inspection was more realistic than were the suggestions I made... I don't understand that the Premier (Bulganin) closed the door."

In reply to a question on Marshal Bulganin's statement concerning disarmament, President Eisenhower replied:

"So I think that the statements that Marshal Bulganin has made should not be taken as at all foreclosing his readiness or the readiness of Soviet representatives to discuss the matter (disarmament)..."

To a question concerning the possibility of new American proposals on disarmament to be submitted to the Disarmament Sub-Committee, the President said:

"I think therefore that you can expect some new proposals, but naturally none of them will be in a final, fixed and rigid position, otherwise there would be no room for negotiations."

(The New York Times, 5th August, 1955)

§

Concluding speech by Marshal Bulganin at the 3rd session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.

"...We naturally are ardent supporters of our own proposals on the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic warfare, but we do not refuse to give serious consideration to any other proposals which are permeated with the desire to find ways to the solution of this problem. As I have already mentioned in my report, one such proposal is that of President Eisenhower concerning the organization of exchange of military information between the Soviet Union and the United States and of reciprocal facilities for aerial photography.

The Soviet government is giving and will continue to give close and serious study to Mr. Eisenhower's proposal, proceeding from the need to reconcile the viewpoints and reach agreement on this highly important question.

We are convinced that in the fight for peace for the peoples we shall continue to work together, and things will go better and all will end well..."

(New Times, 11th August, 1955)

§

Tass announcement of 13th August, 1955.

Recent circumstances, and in particular the results of the Geneva Conference of the heads of government of the four powers, show that a certain lessening of tension has been attained in international relations.

With the aim of achieving a continued easing of international tension and the establishment of confidence among the states, the Soviet government has decided to reduce the strength of the armed forces of the Soviet Union by 640,000 men by 15th December, 1955.

(Soviet News, 15th August, 1955)

§

Statement by Mr. John Foster Dulles at a Press Conference on 16th August, 1955.

(Commenting on the demobilisation of 640,000 Russian troops, Mr. John Foster Dulles made a statement to the press, from which we quote below).

We welcome the Soviet decision to reduce its armed forces by 640,000 men by 15th December 1955, as reported by Tass. If carried out, this action will be in keeping with the general atmosphere of the Geneva conference. The reduction appears to reflect Soviet recognition of the peaceful purposes of the United States and its allies and of the fact that, as President Eisenhower said at Geneva, the United States will never be a party to aggression.

What other factors may lie behind the announced Soviet action we do not know. As the report itself stated, the release of men from the armed forces will make them available for employment in industry and agriculture.

So far as we are aware, this would be the first significant reduction in the number of Soviet armed men power in the past eight years.

The military significance of the Soviet reduction is not easy to judge; no official information has ever been provided as to the size of Soviet armed forces and reserves, or their allocation among the various services, or the weapons systems at their disposal.

Even after this reduction, however, Soviet standing forces will certainly be much larger than those of the United States. Moreover, the number of men under arms is only one element of military strength...

These factors indicate why full information regarding armed forces and effective inspection to verify the facts are necessary for any meaningful and intelligent approach to the problem of international control and reduction of armament. The United States has long sought to build this foundation. President Eisenhower's proposal at Geneva for exchange of information and for aerial inspection is the latest United States initiative in this field.

The United States hopes that the United Nations subcommittee on disarmament can make progress toward establishing a reliable inter-

national system of inspection as it resumes its activities in New York two weeks from now.

(New York Herald Tribune,
17th August, 1955)

§

Statement by Mr. Jules Moch, representative of France on the United Nations Disarmament Subcommittee.

(On his departure for New York, to take part in the work of the Disarmament Subcommittee, reconvened for 29th August, 1955, Mr. Jules Moch made a statement, from which we quote the following).

...After the Franco-British proposals of 19th April last and the Soviet reply of 10th May, the points of view have come very much closer together. Moreover, the spirit emerging from the four Geneva meetings - that of last year which halted the war in Indo-China, the Four Power Conference, the contacts established between the United States and Communist China, and the Atomic Conference - will have a favourable effect on the discussions of the committee of the Five Powers which is to meet in New York in eleven days' time.

The forthcoming session of this committee will of necessity be very brief because of pressure of time. A report must be made to the plenary disarmament commission, composed of delegates from eleven States, in time for the latter to present a report to the sixty delegations at the United Nations General Assembly at the end of September.

Nevertheless, I am more optimistic than ever before and with more reason than hitherto. The recent progress made by peace is irreversible. No one will try to put the clock back. The personal contacts which have been established, particularly at Geneva, the drawing together of points of view which I have already mentioned, the growing awareness of an increasing number of people of the terrifying dangers of atomic weapons and the immense benefits of the atomic revolution, all add to the certainty that a disarmed peace - the only stable form of peace - will be achieved. It is a question of time, but the favourable outcome is no longer in doubt.

I have just witnessed the enthusiasm in Geneva during the Four Power Meeting and the atomic conference. It is clear that man's madness is giving way to his wisdom.

(Le Monde, 19th August, 1955)

§

PRESS COMMENTS

The Times, London, 12th July, 1955.

...In present circumstances there can be no substitute for N.A.T.O. and W.E.U., but it might be possible, as the Prime Minister suggested the other night, to extend the machinery which they provide for arms control to the east as well as to the west. The various stages which disarmament must go through anywhere - divulgence of information, inspection and finally reduction - could be applied to Europe as a whole. If co-operation between the Communist and non-Communist blocs is to work at all, there could be no better proving ground than the appointment of joint inspecting teams aimed at striking a balance between the rival military alliances into which Europe is now divided...

§

James Reston in the New York Times, 13th July, 1955.

...It will be easy for the Soviet leaders to promise the world what it wants - a new beginning, drastic reductions in arms expenditures, abolition of atomic and thermonuclear weapons and more trade - while the West is put in the position of rejecting these things and proposing instead limited slow modifications of a continuing "cold war"...

§

Joseph Alsop in the New York Herald Tribune, 18th July, 1955.

...The Pentagon is undyingly opposed to a serious disarmament effort. The disarmament talks that have taken place to date have aroused no Pentagon opposition because they were thought to be meaningless. But the Pentagon is up in arms now, because serious disarmament talks seem to be a possibility...

§

The New York Herald Tribune, 22nd July, 1955.

"...The effect of yesterday's meeting has been to take the issue of disarmament out of the realm of the doctrinaire and the abstract, bringing it squarely into the realm of practical international arrangements..."

Linking the system of publicity concerning armaments proposed by Mr. Edgar Faure with the proposals of President Eisenhower, the paper's editorial continued:

"...If an effective warning system through inspection and publicity is not as sweeping as total, enforceable abolition of the new weapons, it has the merit of being very much more feasible. And it can lead to the greater sense of security which allows arms reduction to follow..."

§

The Manchester Guardian, 22nd July, 1955.

...President Eisenhower's offer yesterday, for example, is almost too dazzling for immediate decision... But the conference can ask the disarmament experts to consider this as a means of ending their deadlock. It can go further where there is firm common ground between the two sides... Let them test the ground here and see whether the footing is really firm. If so, they can step forward to other agreements.

§

Pravda, Moscow, 22nd July, 1955.

Quoting the following from "France-Soir" of 21st July:

"The Geneva Conference has stirred the whole of America and the New York Stock Exchange has already responded to the first effects..."

the Pravda correspondents in Geneva commented:

"Of course, in these conditions the newspapers connected with those who benefit from the arms race are exerting every effort to poison the international atmosphere..."

"We know that in fact the American public opinion, like that of all countries, is expressing great satisfaction with the improvement in the international atmosphere that has come about..."

"The participants in the talks are making every effort **fully** to understand each other's point of view..."

§

Izvestia, Moscow, 22nd July, 1955.

The Soviet draft...has a special point on the establishment of an effective international control. As **observers** present noted, the system of control proposed by the U.S.S.R. stems completely from the interests of peace and security. It does not in the least infringe the sovereignty of states, and does not provide any opportunity for interference in the affairs of other states, which, it must be said quite openly, are allowed for in certain plans presented in the Western press...

§

Le Monde, Paris, 23rd July, 1955.

A flash of lightning and a clap of thunder accompanied President Eisenhower's proposal on aerial supervision of armaments. They accentuated the "spectacular" aspect. Is it necessary, however, to think it a theatrical manoeuvre, a utopian idea, good only for propaganda?

There is one point it is important to stress, as the President himself has already done: it was not made on the spur of the moment. The plan had been studied for several months in the greatest secrecy by the Pentagon and Mr. Harold Stassen's office...

L'Express, Paris, 23rd July, 1955.

...Mr. Edger Foure made his plan public during a press conference two days before the Geneva meeting.

This plan, which is based on a valid principle, had been hurriedly drawn up, and it came up against very strong objections from the Americans and the British, and even more so from French technical advisers who denounced the grave danger it presents, in its present form, for the development - already quite insufficient - of the French Union. The main thing, however, was that everyone finally paid him a polite "compliment"...

§

The Sunday Times, London, 24th July, 1955.

...The logic is simple. A mutual pledge to abandon nuclear weapons would be reliable, or it would not: if unreliable, it would open the door to the most terrible war of history; if reliable, it would leave the world just as much divided, but bound instead to the conflict of power in so-called conventional weapons. And that, without mitigation by genuine disarmament and genuine solutions of dangerous problems, would leave us actually worse off than we are now. Genuine disarmament depends on a system of inspection and control which not only works but is also seen by all to work. Again, the Geneva Conference faced this reality...

§

The People's Daily, Peking, 26th July, 1955.

...The directive issued by the Four Power Conference to the Foreign Ministers is an important document. It has cleared the way for further discussion and solution of urgent international questions. It is therefore to be hoped that the Foreign Ministers' Conference and the meeting of the Subcommittee of the U.N. Disarmament Commission will achieve greater successes.

The Foreign Ministers' Conference and the Disarmament Subcommittee have the task of finding workable solutions for the various questions. They must therefore show a spirit of conciliation. The Soviet Union has adopted a realistic attitude in the discussions of the various questions at the Four Power Conference. On some issues it has accepted the views of the Western countries on concrete measures to solve them, thus in some cases ensuring a consensus of opinion or bringing the views of the participants nearer to each other in others. But to solve the problems, it is not enough for one side to make concessions. The Western countries should also display the same spirit...

(From "New China News Agency Daily Bulletin", 27th July, 1955).

§

The New York Times, 5th August, 1955.

...Premier Bulganin's report helps put the results of Geneva in proper perspective. If the better relations and friendlier atmosphere created there have improved the international situation, Soviet inflexibility in the face of President Eisenhower's imaginative proposal and Soviet insistence upon the end of NATO and withdrawal of American troops from foreign bases make evident that there is still a long way to go before real agreement and real peace are established. Yet the need for agreement and peace is so universally recognised and so obvious that humanity will continue to hope for much greater progress in the future...

§

The Observer, London, 14th August, 1955.

The Moscow announcement that Soviet armed forces are to be reduced by 640,000 men is the most important Russian contribution to a detente since the signing of the Austrian Treaty, and a good augury for the disarmament talks which are to be resumed by a United Nations sub-committee on 29th August...

§

Le Monde, Paris, 20th August, 1955.

There is no doubt that general political reasons have driven the U.S.S.R. to announce its decision to reduce its army by 640,000 men. If anyone needs to be convinced of this they need only recall that the news was made public shortly before the meeting on disarmament on 29th August and, in particular, before Chancellor Adenauer's visit to Moscow. But one must not ignore the part played by the economic factor in the Kremlin's deliberations.

The demobilisation by the end of the year of such a large number of soldiers is, indeed, a fortunate event for Soviet industry and agriculture...

The demobilised soldiers will provide a particularly welcome labour force, because they are young, energetic, used to hard physical work and well disciplined...

Will this first reduction in Soviet military effectives be followed by others? This can be expected if the disarmament discussions take a favourable turn in the United Nations. In this event the easing of international tension will have the effect, in years to come, of strengthening the economic potential of the U.S.S.R.

§

STATEMENTS BY, AND POINTS OF VIEW
OF VARIOUS PUBLIC FIGURES, ORGANISATIONS AND GROUPS

Resolution adopted at the Forty-Third Inter-Parliamentary Conference.

(We reproduce below a passage from the resolution on the problem of arms reduction and security adopted at the Forty-Third Inter-Parliamentary Conference, held in Vienna, 27th August-2nd September, 1954).

...Deeply aware that all the peoples of the world ^{ardently} desire peace and security in a re-established international society,

Gratified that the U.N. Disarmament Commission has resumed its work,

And convinced that the solution of the disarmament problem can only be found through the United Nations as part of a system of collective security,

Appeals to the Parliaments of the World to use their influence to have all the governments, and those of the countries principally concerned in particular, make contact in order to submit, as part of a general programme to reduce armaments, all atomic weapons and everything appertaining to the field of nuclear energy to the efficient supervision and control of the United Nations and to envisage methods and means of prohibiting the use of atomic weapons and their manufacture...

(This text is translated from the French).

§

Message from the World Congress of Mothers to the Conference of Heads of Government of the Four Powers.

(The World Congress of Mothers, which was held in Lausanne from 7th to 10th July, 1955, with the participation of delegations from 66 countries and all continents, representing different opinions and social backgrounds, sent a message to the Four Power Conference, from which we quote the passage below).

...We hope and expect that the following principles will be affirmed:-

...that the conditions for substantial and general disarmament of all countries should be created;

that there should be immediately established international agreement which will prohibit the manufacture of atomic and thermo-nuclear weapons, regulate their controlled destruction and prohibit further experiments in their use...

(Unanimously adopted 10th July, 1955).

§

Manifesto of the World Congress of Mothers.

...We do not want war .

Let our voices be raised ever more powerfully; we reject with horror the very idea of the use of atomic weapons.

We demand their prohibition and destruction.

We desire that nuclear energy be used only for peaceful ends.

We cannot bear to see immense sums being swallowed up in war preparations while countless human beings go hungry.

Impose disarmament!

We demand that the money allocated to the manufacture of arms be used to build houses, hospitals, schools, maternity clinics, and to give our children more of the good things of life.

All the resources of the earth should help to improve man's lot...

(Unanimously adopted 10th July, 1955).

§

The World Federation of Trade Unions' Message to the Heads of Government of the Four Powers.

...The workers realise clearly that only in peace can they extend the freedoms they have won and increase their solidarity; it is only in peace that they can go forward to constantly improving living conditions, and thus take the whole of mankind forward along the path of progress.

That is why the workers of the world earnestly wish for a relaxation of international tension, the settlement of disputed questions between states by negotiation, the banning of atomic and nuclear weapons, disarmament, the respecting of the independence and integrity of all states, the development of trade and cultural relations between all countries...

(World Trade Union News, No.14,
15th-31st July, 1955).

§

Message from the International Federation of Resistance Fighters to the Heads of Government of the Four Powers meeting at Geneva.

The fighters in the European Resistance Movements, the former deportees to Hitler's concentration camps, the victims of nazism and the relatives of the dead of 20 countries, belonging to the International Federation of Resistance Fighters, greet the Geneva Conference with the wish that, to re-establish peace, it revives the spirit of understanding between the great powers which led to victory over Hitler's armies...

So that an easing of tension and an era of peace may come about, they ask that your negotiations be based on the will to reach an

agreement which would dispel the threat of a remilitarised Germany, efface the potential spectre of war constituted by the division of Germany, guarantee the security of all peoples of Europe, prohibit weapons of mass destruction and bring about general, progressive and controlled disarmament so greatly desired by the peoples.

(Information Service,
International Federation of
Resistance Fighters, Vienna,
23rd July, 1955).

§

Appeal of the International Co-operative Alliance for Disarmament.

(For its 60th anniversary on 19th August, the International Co-operative Alliance issued a statement, from which we reproduce the section on disarmament).

The International Co-operative Alliance calls on its affiliated organisations to ask their governments once again:

- to renew their efforts, through the United Nations, to achieve an agreement on the limitation of armaments of all types as a first step to total disarmament;
- to set up an impartial and effective organ for the supervision and control of armaments and the production thereof in all nations...

§

Statement by Scientists issued by Bertrand Russell.

(On 9th July, a statement was released by Bertrand Russell at a press conference in Caxton Hall in London, and signed by Professor P.W. Bridgman, Harvard University, Nobel Prize for Physics; the late Professor Albert Einstein, Nobel Prize for Physics (who signed a week before his death); Professor Leopold Infeld, Warsaw University, member of the Polish Academy of Sciences; Professor Frederic Joliot-Curie, Paris University, Nobel Prize for Chemistry; Professor H.J. Muller, University of Indiana, Nobel Prize for Physiology and Medicine; Professor C.F. Powell, Bristol University, Nobel Prize for Physics; Professor J. Rotblatt, London University and St. Bartholomew's Hospital Medical School; Professor Hideki Yukawa, Tokio University, Nobel Prize for Physics. Professor Joliot-Curie and Professor Muller expressed certain reservations in signing the statement.

We reproduce a part of the statement and the draft resolution proposed for an International Scientists' Conference).

Although an agreement to renounce nuclear weapons as part of a general reduction of armaments would not afford an ultimate solution, it would serve certain important purposes.

1. - Any agreement between East and West is to the good insofar as it tends to diminish tension.

2. - The abolition of thermo-nuclear weapons, if each side believed that the other had carried it out sincerely, would lessen the fear of a sudden attack which at present keeps both sides in a state of nervous apprehension. We should, therefore, welcome such an agreement, though only as a first step.

Most of us are not neutral in feeling, but, as human beings, we have to remember that, if the issues between East and West are to be decided in any manner that can give any possible satisfaction to anybody, whether Communist or anti-Communist, whether Asian or European or American, whether white or black, then these issues must not be decided by war.

We should wish this to be understood, both in the East and in the West.

There lies before us, if we choose, continual progress in happiness, knowledge and wisdom.

Resolution

In view of the fact that in any future world war, nuclear weapons will certainly be employed, and that such weapons threaten the continued existence of mankind, we urge the Governments of the world to realise, and to acknowledge, publicly, that their purposes cannot be furthered by a world war, and we urge them, consequently, to find peaceful means for the settlement of all matters of dispute between them.

§

Mr. Lester Pearson, Canadian Foreign Minister, on the Russell declaration.

On 11th July, Mr. Pearson said in the Commons that it should be the aim of statesmen in this nuclear age to find a more stable and enduring basis for the preservation of peace than the certainty of common destruction if an all-out war began... The problems created by this peril called for co-ordinated international effort, regardless of ideological, political or other barriers, in order to overcome the danger of cumulative lethal radioactivity which might ultimately threaten the extinction of humanity.

(The Times, 12th July, 1955).

§

Statement by Sir Anthony Eden on the Russell declaration.

I therefore welcome the fact that the statement recognizes that it is war itself and not simply nuclear weapons which must be abolished, and that the renunciation of nuclear weapons must form part of a general reduction of armaments. This is in full accord with the policy which Her Majesty's Government have consistently followed.

It is my hope that at the forthcoming meeting at Geneva we shall by patience and perseverance be able to make progress towards reducing the troubles and easing the tension which now beset the world.

(The Times, 16th July, 1955). - 44 -

Resolution passed by the World Conference of Scientists in London.

(Following the Russell Declaration, an international conference of scientists was held in London from 3rd to 5th August, 1955, convened by the World Association of Parliamentarians for World Government. The resolution below was adopted unanimously at the closing session).

Since in any future war nuclear weapons will probably be employed and since such weapons threaten to bring immeasurable suffering for humanity and material destruction and possibly even the end of mankind, we urge, therefore, the Governments of the world to realise and to acknowledge publicly that their purposes cannot be furthered by world war; consequently we urge the full and open examination of the implications of recent scientific developments for humanity as a whole and the promotion of peaceful means for the settlement of all matters of international dispute.

(The Manchester Guardian, 6th August, 1955).

§

Article by Mr. Aneurin Bevan.

(After the Geneva Four Power Conference, Mr. Aneurin Bevan wrote an article published in 'Tribune' under the title "Verdict on Geneva" and in 'L'Express' (Paris) under the title "Let Us Plan the Next Step", in which, after enumerating the results of the Conference, he dealt with the question of Germany, NATO and disarmament. Below we quote the section from 'L'Express' dealing with the last point).

If President Eisenhower's proposal comes to anything, it will do so not as an isolated measure, but as forming part of a general scheme of progressive disarmament. Proposals about disarmament have been referred to the disarmament sub-committee of the United Nations but they are expected to be taken up again by the Foreign Ministers in October.

Disarmament poses a crucial problem for the Western nations. It is essential that the economic repercussions of disarmament upon the Western social systems should be studied without delay, otherwise disarmament will meet with opposition from various powerful elements.

The distribution of aid to under-developed countries could prove the greatest economic operation carried out by man. It would be ten thousand pities if, for lack of effective preparation, it turned out to be a source of misery to both giver and receiver.

Disarmament should come as a message of hope and deliverance and not as a harbinger of economic chaos accompanied by mass unemployment...

(L'Express, 30th July, 1955, and Tribune, 29th July, 1955).

§

The Pan-European Union calls for the outlawing of the H-bomb.

(M. de Coudenhove-Kalergi, President of the Pan-European Union, sent the appeal below to the Heads of Government of the Four Powers).

It is for you, Mr. Chairman, and your colleagues, to open your great crusade for peace by outlawing the H-bomb, enemy No.1 of mankind.

In view of the existence of atomic artillery, any attempt to include all nuclear weapons at the outset would raise complicated problems. Any immediate action would prove impossible.

But the outlawing of the H-bomb, before your departure from Geneva, would call only for goodwill and courage.

This is what the world expects from the statesmen meeting in Geneva.

(Le Monde, 19th July, 1955).

§

CONFERENCE OF ASIAN NATIONS AT NEW DELHI

and

THE WORLD ASSEMBLY OF THE FORCES OF PEACE AT HELSINKI

Resolution on political questions adopted by the Conference of Asian Countries held at New Delhi.

(The Asian Conference for a relaxation of international tension was held in New Delhi from 6th to 10th April, 1955, on the initiative of leading people of varying opinions from several Asian countries. Approximately two hundred delegates participated, representing the points of view of 18 countries of Asia and the Middle East - India, China, Japan, Soviet Union, Pakistan, Burma, Syria, the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, Ceylon, Lebanon, Jordan, etc

The Conference adopted resolutions on political, economic, scientific and cultural questions as well as on colonialism, interference in the internal affairs of other countries and the Arab peoples' right for freedom and national independence.

We reproduce below an extract from the resolution on political questions dealing with the disarmament problem).

The international atmosphere is being continuously poisoned by threats of mass destruction and use of nuclear weapons against the peoples. Eminent scientists, leading public figures, religious leaders the world over have joined in mounting protest against the manufacture of weapons of mass destruction.

We support all the campaigns launched in various countries to channelize public protest against these weapons and to make the people fully conscious of their effects.

This Conference of Asian Countries demands that nuclear, bacteriological and chemical weapons must be banned.

We demand universal disarmament, prohibition and immediate cessation of experiments in nuclear weapons. We demand that the present stock-piles be dismantled and the some materials utilized for constructive and peaceful developments.

We urge strict international control for the implementation of the proposals regarding these weapons...

This conference records its absolute and complete opposition to all military pacts and military bases in Asia, such as SEATO, the Turkey-Iraq pact and similar pacts that vitally and directly affect the Asian countries. We demand the removal of all foreign troops and bases from Asian soil.

We condemn the direct and indirect pressure being exerted on Asian countries to coerce them to join military pacts...

Speech by Mr. Jean-Paul Sartre, Member of the World Council of Peace, to the World Assembly of the Forces of Peace at Helsinki.

...Nothing could be easier and more ineffectual than to eliminate the bomb by a stroke of the pen. If we were compelled to stop there, Bertrand Russell would be perfectly right. Even with the thermo-nuclear weapons outlawed, there is nothing to prevent us from supposing that in a future war one of the belligerents might have recourse to it whether to surprise his opponent with a blitzkrieg, or in order to avoid defeat after many reverses. To ban the use of the bomb would mean going back to 1939. But the fact is that we are no longer in 1939, since the bomb exists, and even if the stock of atomic weapons were destroyed, the methods for making others are known. We must not attempt to go backwards to establish peace; on the contrary, we must go forward. Professor Joliot-Curie has shown that the banning of thermonuclear weapons can be conceived only within the general perspective of disarmament. War knows no law: if it breaks out, there is no evidence to show that the bomb will not be used. To prevent the use of the bomb we must prevent war. And that is precisely what is new: simultaneous disarmament demanded by the peoples themselves would, if it took place, amount to a veritable revolution in human history...

§

Speech by Mr. Alexander Korneichuk, Member of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. and Member of the Bureau of the World Council of Peace, to the World Assembly of the Forces of Peace at Helsinki.

...The Soviet proposals state that owing to the absence of trust between states, a situation has been created in which not a single state can, without risking its security, allow any other state to become familiar with its military production and other resources. The present absence of the necessary confidence between states can create a situation in which decisions on international control will in practice be reduced to a pure formality. Highly competent people have pointed out that control over atomic weapons is particularly difficult because of the very nature of atomic production, since production of atomic energy for peaceful purposes can be used to stock-pile reserves of explosive materials in ever-increasing quantities. It is not so difficult for states with enterprises for the production of atomic energy to infringe the relative agreements and stock-pile a large quantity of explosive materials for the production of atomic and hydrogen bombs. And it is no problem for such states to organise their mass production.

In such a situation the potential aggressor can prepare an unexpected blow against a peace-loving state although he may have signed the agreement.

Until an atmosphere of confidence has been created for relations between states any agreement on the establishment of international control can only deaden the vigilance of the peoples and create a feeling of false security...

• §

Message from Mr. Pietro Nenni, Vice-President of the World Council of Peace, to the World Assembly of the Forces of Peace at Helsinki.

...Equally we must underline the progress made on the question of limiting armaments.

The criterion that the limitation of armaments must not be mechanical and uniform, but determined for each country at present-day level of arms and taking into account the size of its territory and frontiers, has introduced into the discussion an element facilitating agreement.

Nevertheless, nothing or very little will be achieved along these lines if we do not obtain the banning of the atomic bomb and of thermonuclear weapons - which has always been the basic demand of our Movement...

§

Speech by Mr. Kuo Mo-jo, Vice-President of the World Council of Peace, to the Helsinki World Assembly of the Forces of Peace.

...It further behoves me to mention the proposal for reduction of armaments, prohibition of atomic weapons and the removal of the threat of a new war, made by the Government of the U.S.S.R. on 11th May. Therein a definite scheme is set out for the realisation of a general reduction of armaments. If countries can arrive at an agreement on the basis of these proposals, the military burden on the broad masses of the people will be relieved, and people of all countries will be enabled to live in peace and tranquillity, removed from the possible calamities of a new war. The people of the whole world are still awaiting the reply to the Soviet proposal by the governments of other countries. We hope that this Assembly will study the proposal, and will effectively mobilise world opinion to ensure that the governments of various countries speedily arrive at an agreement on the question of reduction of armaments, prohibition of atomic weapons, and removal of threats of new wars. To achieve this end the Chinese people will do their utmost. They will vehemently oppose atomic war...

§

Statement of the Commission on Disarmament and Atomic Weapons of the Helsinki World Assembly for Peace.

...It is now clear, however, that the effective abolition of nuclear weapons cannot be obtained as an isolated act. It must take place within the framework of a general scheme of disarmament.

A substantial measure of general disarmament is necessary not only for its own sake, but also to reduce the present state of tension in the world, and enable the growth of the necessary trust for fruitful co-operation. That general disarmament is fully possible is shown by the wide progress already made toward agreement.

A fair scheme must include practical measures in relation to all types of weapons, equally affecting those supposed to favour the military interests of any one group of countries or another.

Such a scheme must include:

- the stopping of test explosions of nuclear weapons;
- a solemn agreement not to use nuclear weapons;
- the abolition of nuclear weapons and substantial and progressive disarmament by agreed stages, both under strict control;
- a fair control system, one that makes evasion by any country impossible and which includes observers stationed at ports, military establishments, arms factories, sources of atomic raw material production, atomic installations, etc.

All this has in principle been agreed in the Anglo-French and Soviet plans now before the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations. To embrace all countries in these measures a conference must be held including all governments, both those inside and those outside the United Nations. Agreement is urgent, and implementation must be as swift as practicable.

To make disarmament fully effective the whole range of these measures must be carried out, but any and every agreed step in these directions is good, because each agreement made and carried out will increase confidence to go further.

The governments must agree and act - to this they are bidden alike by their responsibility for the safety of their own countries and by their duty towards mankind.

Effective disarmament and the removal of the atomic threat will open immense possibilities for the benefit of mankind. Labour and material resources, no longer diverted to destructive ends, will become available for production and so immeasurably increase the welfare of all peoples. Only along this path can the benefits envisaged in the proposals for peaceful use of atomic energy, made by President Eisenhower and Premier Bulganin respectively, be fully realised. Along this path atomic energy can make real a golden age.

It is in the hands of the peoples to prevent the madness of atomic war which would cause irreparable harm to all the peoples of the world without exception. It is in their hands to ensure that agreements shall be made and that they shall be kept. Vigilance must never be relaxed.

The mighty movement of public opinion all over the world, the growing number of declarations by parliaments, statesmen and organisations that it inspires - outstandingly the decision on nuclear weapons of the Asian-African Conference at Bandung - represent but a beginning.

The coming meeting of the heads of state of the Four Great Powers at Geneva affords a great new opportunity. The peoples of the world demand and will ensure that it be carried forward to success.

Helsinki Appeal

(At the closing session of the World Assembly for Peace at Helsinki, an Appeal, from which we quote the passage relating to disarmament, was voted as follows:-

1,486 in favour
1 abstention
6 did not take part in the voting).

...On the problem of disarmament and atomic weapons, deadlocked till now by intransigent opposition, the points of view have come so close that agreement is now only a matter of goodwill...

§

Collection Number: AD1812

RECORDS RELATING TO THE 'TREASON TRIAL' (REGINA vs F. ADAMS AND OTHERS ON CHARGE OF HIGH TREASON, ETC.), 1956 1961

TREASON TRIAL, 1956 1961

PUBLISHER:

Publisher:- Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand

Location:- Johannesburg

©2012

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. While these digital records are true facsimiles of the collection records and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

This document is part of a private collection deposited with Historical Papers at The University of the Witwatersrand.