

PAUL ROBESON

ST

U. S. A.

Message from Paul Robeson

Dear dear friends,

Again may I thank you for your invitation to be with you this evening. Somehow it seems that not long ago it was my privilege. Those most recent visits have been treasured deeply in my mind and heart. The splendid achievements of the Peace Councils throughout the world, the magnificent contribution of the British Council in stirring opinion and winning broad forces of all sections of British life to support the cause of Peace, to force cultural exchange and mutually advantageous trade relations, have encouraged and inspired us here in our own land.

History moves speedily in these days and one senses the beginning of a real change in many regions of American life. The challenge to the demagogues, especially McCarthy, has been taken up and we hope that soon they will be sent back to retire. The American people, disturbed and confused, but in the main wanting Peace like any other folk, have started to move. Many progressive-minded citizens active in the days of Roosevelt and through '48 are coming back in the public arena, so look for better news from this side.

Ours is a mighty responsibility here in this land of powerful would-be makers of war, and it has been a source of deep pride to be working side by side with many brave and



ROBESON

- 2 -

ST

courageous fighters for peace and a decent world: those who have suffered and still suffer prison and privation.

But the will of the people, the will of the world's people - and of them we are a part - shall prevail, for sanity, for Peace and friendship. Know that I am in the middle of the struggle - I love that word struggle - and there I shall remain as long as duty and responsibility call. Let us hope that soon it will be my good fortune to join in some of the conferences to bring greetings from the growing thousands here fighting with you to<sup>help</sup> ensure Peace and new freedom of many still pressing forward to new horizons.

All my best to you and to the people of your land. My heart-felt wishes to my brothers and sisters of Africa and of the Islands of the Carribean. We shall together build a world where we shall live in Peace and yet with love of all for their fellows. In the words of the great Chilean poet, Neruda: "Though I am not there, I here pound the table with love."

I came to sing for you and for you to sing with me.



WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE

(STOCKHOLM Session, November 18-23, 1954)

Proposed Order of Proceedings

ooo000ooo

Thursday 18th November

10.00 - 1.00 p.m.

PLENARY SESSION

Opening speech by Pastor Sven Hektor. (Sweden), Member of the World Peace Council.

Proposal and adoption of Agenda.

Report on the first item on the Agenda.

"Co-operation of all the states of Europe in the organisation of their common security!"

- Senator Ambrogio DONINI (Italy).

- M. Gilbert de CHAMBRUN. M.P. (France)

Discussion on the first item on the Agenda.

3.30 - 7.30 p.m.

Continuation of discussion on the first item on the Agenda.

Friday 19th November

9.00 - 1.00 p.m.

PLENARY SESSION

Report on the second item on the Agenda.

"The situation created in different parts of Asia by foreign intervention and by the system of military blocs and coalitions!"

Report presented by the Indian delegation.

Discussion on the second item on the Agenda.

3.30

Discussion on the second item on the Agenda continued.

5.00 - 7.30 p.m.

Report on the third item on the Agenda.

"The situation created in Latin America by interference in the internal affairs of nations."

- Report presented by the Brazilian delegation.

- Discussion on the third item on the Agenda.



WORLD COUNCIL OF FIDUCY

PROCEEDINGS Session, November 12-14, 1944

Proposed Order of Proceedings

- 3) *Continued*
- 2) *Organic changes*
- 1) *Palmer*

Friday 14th November

10.00 - 11.00 p.m.

PLenary Session

Opening speech by Lester K. Born

Report of the Secretary, Lester K. Born

the World Peace Council

Proposed and adopted by the Council

Report on the first year of the

Agency

Co-operation of all the states

of Europe in the organization

their common security

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Friday 14th November

10.00 - 11.00 p.m.

PLenary Session

Report on the second year of the

Agency

Co-operation of all the states

of Europe in the organization

their common security

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

Participation of the states

of the World Peace Council

10.00 - 11.00 p.m.



Friday 19th November, contd.

9.00 - 11.00 p.m.

NIGHT SESSION

- Discussion on the third item on the Agenda continued.

Saturday 20th November.

9.a.m.- 1.00 p.m.

PLENARY SESSION

- Report on the fourth item on the Agenda.
- "Action of peace forces to secure disarmament and the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction."
- Dr. E.H.S. BURHOP. (Gt.Britain).

Discussion on the fourth item on the Agenda.

3.p.m. - 7.30 p.m.

Meetings of Commissions.

Sunday 21st November

9.a.m. - 1.00 p.m.

PLENARY SESSION

- Report on the fifth item on the Agenda

"Preparation of an Assembly of representatives of the forces of peace in all countries during the first half of 1955."

Discussion on the fifth item on the Agenda.

3.30. - 6.00 p.m.

Meetings of Commissions.

Monday 22nd November

9.00 a.m. - 1.00 p.m.

Meetings of Commissions

3.00 p.m. - 6.00 p.m.

Meetings of Commissions

8.00 p.m.

Reception at the Town HallTuesday 23rd November

9.00 a.m. - 1.00 p.m.

Meetings of the Commissions for adoption of proposed resolutions.

3.30 p.m.

PLENARY SESSION

- Report on the work of the Commissions
- Adoption of texts and documents.
- Closing Speech.



Mr. J. BURNS  
Great Britain

ST

Mr. Chairman,

I am aware that the sands of time are running fast against us. So much has been said and so much ground at this Conference has already been covered by previous speakers, that I do not intend to take up the valuable time now left to us in the reiteration of points already made, but will confine my contribution to the British approach of the problem of German rearmament.

Less than two months ago the Annual Conference of the British Labour Party met in a seaside town in Yorkshire, and it is a thousand pities that the clean sea air did not penetrate into the Conference hall. For one of the dirtiest decisions in the whole history of the British Labour Party was taken at Scarborough in the last week of September.

Because of the very close vote taken only a few weeks before at Brighton when the Trades Union Congress met and agreed by a very narrow majority to support German rearmament, the platform at Scarborough were in a panic.

One has only to remember that it was by the defection of one trade union, and not a big union at that, who opposed it at Brighton and supported it at Scarborough, that the platform gained its very dubious victory. It showed clearly how correct were the fears of certain leaders that vast sections of the British public were bitterly opposed to rearming once again the old Hitler gang.

A great message of hope to the world was ignored, and a great opportunity of giving a lead was sacrificed on the altar of anti-communism, for had Clement Attlee given the call of No German Rearmament, then he would have had the support of the overwhelming mass of the British people behind him. For peoples of all parties and no party at all, of all religions and no



religion, would have rallied to such a call, and the Tories would have been swept from power at Westminster and a new era would have dawned in the field of international relationships. One only has to look at the great campaign carried out by the Daily Express to realise how deep and how wide is the opposition in Britain to lending any form of assistance to those who would once again re-create the Nazi war machine. But although a decision was taken, it is not the true or the real position by any means, and was arrived at only by the agency of the block votes of three or four of the big trade unions.

The constituency Labour Parties who attended the Annual Conference on behalf of the political wing of the movement, are in far closer touch with the ordinary rank and file membership, and reflect the mood and the desires of their members, far more accurately than do the leaders of some of the big battalions.

For their mandates are not based on decisions taken a couple of years before but are topical and up-to-date, and in the field of foreign affairs, where a new policy has to be formulated in a matter of days or even weeks, in order to meet new situations, this aspect of the British Labour movement must not be overlooked or ignored. For the constituency parties representing over one million votes went on record almost unanimously against German rearmament.

But regardless of the present situation we must concentrate on the future. For amongst certain sections there is a feeling of despair. They adopt the attitude that now all is lost, the fell deed is accomplished and there is nothing now we can do about it. Such thinking is far too dangerous to be allowed to continue unchallenged, and people holding such views, must be jerked out of their apathy. For the greatest fights and struggles of the common man have always been waged against



seemingly impossible odds. And progressive thought is under no illusions as to the magnitude of the task which lies ahead, and are well aware of the tremendous, inhuman and ruthless power of the reactionary forces arrayed against them.

It is true that the present British Government has agreed that German rearmament should be put into effect, and as soon as possible.

It is true that support for such a policy was carried at Scarborough. But the present Government will go.

And the Labour Party who will be the next Government in Britain can and will be changed in her direction and policy.

For a new leadership is emerging.

The constituency parties and the small left wing trade unions are playing an ever-increasing role in shaping the policies of the party. And with some of the larger unions now coming into the fight on the side of progress it is by no means certain that Britain's troops will be engaged in Germany for another 44 years, or that the British people are in any way solidly behind this treaty even though it is ratified by Parliament. And in support of what I have said when I tell this Conference that only last night in the House of Commons agreement was reached by only 266 to 6, which represents less than 50 per cent of the voting strength of the House, it shows very clearly that there are not only six brave courageous men, but hundreds more extremely worried and uneasy. And will be receptive to alternative approaches to the German Problem.

There also is in Britain an ever-growing body of public opinion who for various reasons are pressing for reduction in the period of conscripted service, and eventually abolishing conscription altogether. And again this is another aspect which should not be ignored.



So therefore I say to this Conference let us not approach the future with any feeling of pessimism or, what is worse, in a spirit of defeatism, but let us support all efforts to bring about a meeting of all the European nations, or the Four Great Powers, before the wish of certain right wing elements is transformed into the deed. Let us do this for we will gather friends and allies on the way and as true as I stand here the day will come when the common man will triumph over the forces of reaction.

And as far as we in Britain are concerned, that new leadership of which I spoke earlier is determined to wipe out this blot on our Socialist honour, and redeem ourselves in the eyes of our comrades in Germany.

Not East Germany or West Germany, but Germany, United, Democratic, Peaceful.



M. ALAIN LE LEAP.

-1-

FRANCE.

Dear Friends,

History has taught our people that German militarism has always threatened France with enslavement and loss of territory and has besides confronted us with the problem of the independence of our motherland.

The London and Paris Agreements giving Western Germany an army five hundred thousand strong, ~~armoured forces~~ and air forces, as well as putting under military training a reserve army of five million men, revives this danger for us.

Not wishing to renew unhappy experiences, we give no credence to the promises made by Adenauer in London, not to attempt to alter by force the present frontiers of the Germany of Bonn. If we needed convincing, the territorial claims made by other members of his government give us ample proof of the reality of the danger that exists.

And this danger, which once again confronts France, similarly confronts other countries in Europe, and particularly countries bordering on Germany.

But the danger and our fears do not rest there. For at the same time as we rearm Western Germany, we bring it into a military coalition which makes each of the participating states jointly responsible with the others. This means also that France risks seeing itself drawn, at the side of Germany, into a war which the Bonn government wants. In the era of the atomic bomb, and with the possibility given to Germany of making use of it, it becomes a question of life and death to all our people.

And this danger is the same for all the other peoples of Europe without a single exception. Radio-activity does not attack only the combatants; it refuses to recognise neutrals, and it can even reach allies.

To restrain the anxiety and opposition of our people we are told that the rearmament of Germany will be limited. But the clauses themselves allow the limitations which are now proposed to be modified by a simple majority of the Council of the Brussels Pact. This clearly shows that the possible opposition of France would be completely fruitless. And how can we imagine that there really is a sincere intention to limit armaments? German rearmament has the aim of preparing for war, and those who want to make ready for war do so with an eye to victory. They are thus led to increase their military potential to the maximum on a permanent basis.

Let us suppose just for a moment that, as they want to make us believe, the advocates of this rearmament have no aim other than to develop the strength of the West



FRANCE.

before starting, and in order to start, discussion with the East. If it is true that the East cannot remain unmoved and so arms itself it turn, the tactic which consists of wanting to have the greatest military strength at the time of negotiation, will inevitably lead also to raising the military potential to the maximum.

Since then the armaments race has naturally intensified. The French workers, and the whole of the population of our country with them, have experienced for several years the continuous deterioration of their standard of life in proportion to the increasing weight of military expenditure. They know what this policy in which the government wishes to involve the country, means for them in increased poverty.

I would add that if the Atlantic Coalition pushes on with its rearmament in such conditions, it will quite naturally be led to consent to the maximum rearmament of the country whose government is most anxious for it, that is to say in the present state of things, the maximum rearmament of Western Germany. It will be the German workers, it will be the entire German population who will then know, themselves, the hard reality of ever more poverty.

But at the same time, as I said at the beginning of this speech, France will experience the danger of German militarism developing on her frontiers. She will be led to take the measures necessary to ensure her protection, in other words inevitably to arm even more in her turn.

That means not only that the armaments race will be started between East and West, but within the Atlantic Coalition itself an armaments race will start between France and Western Germany; ... it has in fact started already because M. Mendes-France has had to ask that France should have 18 divisions instead of the planned 14.

I will add further that the agreements provide that the military forces under the command of the supreme military leader, at present the American General Gruenther, will be stationed according to the N.A.T.O. strategy, which means that French troops would be stationed in Western Germany and German troops in France and Belgium, for example. Thus not only will the occupation of Germany be perpetuated by the application of the London and Paris Agreements but all the member states in continental Europe will be liable to similar occupation.

Finally it is also planned that should a similar situation arise in a member state, which is considered likely to cause disorder or to compromise the security and the economy of the Western Bloc, the other member states could intervene. This leads us to think that intervention of foreign armed forces will be always possible in any of the countries, to put down popular



## FRANCE.

demonstrations: strikes by workers, action by peace organisations or others. German armed forces in France, French armed forces in Germany, to reiterate what I said just now, could thus be called on to repress the legitimate aspirations of the peoples for the independence of their country, for peace, for their well-being.

It is against all that and essentially against the German danger that our people are taking their stand, that our people intend to protect themselves.

Monsieur Mendes-France maintained, and maintains still, that the policy which he follows is a policy of peace, a democratic, social policy. This policy, he maintains, will bring about a Franco-German reconciliation.

I should like to examine these assertions with you. We know that a policy in support of the armaments race leads to war and is a barrier to all social progress. But is it favourable to a Franco-German reconciliation? No. A certain amount of cynicism is required to present it in this way, to a people still suffering in flesh and spirit from the Nazi atrocities. We want a Franco-German reconciliation - we desire it ardently - but it will not be brought about by an alliance of the Franco-German trusts, of Krupp and Schneider; it will not be brought about by an alliance between Adenauer and his Nazi generals on the one hand and Monsieur Mendes-France on the other. Furthermore, such alliances are primarily contrary to the interests of France and Germany. It is we who will bring about Franco-German reconciliation by the increasing development of friendly, brotherly relations between the French and German peoples. And the forces for Peace in Western Germany, all the forces for Peace in Western Germany - the German communists, the German Social-Democrats, the German Trade Unionists who unanimously (apart from four abstentions) voted against the re-militarisation of their country at their recent congress, the German partisans for Peace, should know that they can fully count on the complete solidarity of the French people.

I would insert a parenthesis here. The French C.G.T. has made every effort to develop to the utmost relations between French and German workers, between one undertaking and another. This was done in the first instance by sending letters and messages, and now as frequently as possible by the exchange of delegations. German workers have thus come to France and will continue to come, and French workers have been to Western Germany and will continue to go there.

Already, on both sides of the frontier, the repercussions of this experience are great. In this way we hope to combat successfully the grievous consequences in Western Germany of the French government's policy which, by strengthening the position of Adenauer and the German



FRANCE.

militarists, is in fact attacking the democratic and peaceful forces of that country. It is towards these democratic and peaceful forces that we turn; it is they who assure us of support; it is they to whom we hold out our hands. Thus we hope to nullify the effects of the campaigns of hate and war and bring about a Franco-German reconciliation; and we are proud to think that in this way we are serving - and very usefully serving - the cause of Peace.

Dear Friends, it is not those in England and in other European countries who support German rearmament who can give France guarantees of security. History and geography teach us that the only efficacious guarantee against German rearmament which has been given to our people up to the present has been the logical, traditional alliance between France and Tsarist Russia before 1917, and between France and the Soviet Union since then. Up to the present only the Franco-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Mutual Assistance, signed on 10th December 1944, has given our people any real guarantee against German rearmament.

Now, instead of restoring the full power of this treaty, which it would be in the interests of France and furthermore of Europe for them to do, the French government is doing the direct opposite and, in permitting the rearmament of Western Germany in violation of this very treaty, is creating an atmosphere of insecurity.

Perhaps it may be said that though this is the opinion of the French working class, it is not yet that of the French nation. This is not true and the common feeling on this point between the different classes of our people is increasing daily. But let us accept the existence of those who do not think as we do; let us accept, too, the existence of states in Europe who can still believe that they are threatened by the East. What guarantees must they be given to eradicate the feeling of insecurity which they have; particularly if the German people feel threatened, how can we help them recover their confidence? In our opinion, this is exactly what the Soviet government wants and implies. And its suggestion for a conference to organise European collective security answers any qualms with regard to this, and is designed to calm any fears. For these reasons we give it our support, in the same way that we would have supported any proposal capable under similar conditions of advancing disarmament and consolidating Peace.

Our people will not be satisfied with the rejection of the London and Paris Agreements, after having imposed the rejection of E.D.C. They intend that France shall play her part in the construction of European Collective Security. This idea of collective security, supported, for example, by such men as M. Herriot and M. Paul Boncour, has spread throughout the most varied sections of the French nation.



FRANCE.

Moreover, we must clarify its meaning to show that it would have its fullest effect only to the extent that each country, large or small, will be granted the guarantees that it asks for, which pre-supposes the recognition of an absolute equality between the states involved in the discussion. It would have its fullest effect only to the extent that the discussion is frank and without reticence, and that each helps with all its might to build effectively an agreement leading to disarmament. It would have its fullest effect only to the extent that all the means of relaxing international tensions are put into operation and more than just simple co-existence, co-operation between all the countries can be established.

It is upon these bases that our activities grow. In what sort of atmosphere does this growth take place ?

If certain politicians who were coming close to our movement at the time of the fight against E.D.C. are today hesitating to support our action against the London and Paris agreements, or even to work in a similar direction, because they continue to believe that M. Mendes-France wishes to negotiate, and in those circumstances it is better not to hinder him, it is still true that the popular forces have lost nothing of their unity or their power.

Notably in industry, the workers in general are signing our petition even more speedily and in far larger numbers than they did against E.D.C. Their activities are developing on the basis of the greatest unity whatever their opinions or their union affiliations. It is a most important thing to see developing in this way in the factories themselves this heightening of consciousness and this class unity among the workers as a whole. This follows from the explanatory work done during our campaign against E.D.C., from the clear perception of what the consequences would be to everybody of the acceleration of the armaments race, inevitably provoked by the application of the London and Paris Agreements; it follows from the complete opposition of our working-class to German rearmament under whatever guise. It is fair to say that it follows too from the fact that in certain political circles, groups favourable to E.D.C. have presented this E.D.C. as the only means of preventing unilateral German rearmament and themselves underlined, at that time, the danger of such a unilateral rearmament. With E.D.C. rejected, the argument that they made against unilateral rearmament has remained in the mind of those whom they have influenced. Such are the reasons for presenting in this optimistic way the first results of our popular campaign.

Nevertheless, because we feel that the position of France can be the determining factor, as it was in the fight against E.D.C., it is our duty to say to you with the utmost gravity that we consider the situation



M. ALAIN LE LEAP.  
FRANCE.

-6-

to be serious. Serious because our Parliament does not reflect the wishes of our people. Serious because in the Chamber of Deputies those formerly hostile to E.D.C. no longer take up a clear position against the London and Paris Agreements, for a variety of reasons. But have no fear, we have not among us the slightest trace of discouragement, renunciation or surrender. Our pressure will be forcefully exerted, our delegations will multiply to the utmost, lobbying members of Parliament and making them listen to the voice of the nation. During our discussion, many speeches have been made referring to the struggle of the French people and so showing its importance in our common struggle. In the discussion our traditional friendship which unites our people with the people of the Soviet Union and of Poland has been recalled. We have been extremely moved. Our friend Ilya Ehrenburg said yesterday: "To the fighters for Peace, France has been, is and will be the country of our greatest hopes and greatest possibilities". Very simply, I thank Ilya Ehrenburg for these words. But it is precisely this confidence that you have in us which increases our responsibilities and it is our duty to all of you to be sincere. Whatever may come, you may rest assured that our people will do their duty, their full duty, and that we shall be prepared to do it in all circumstances. Our desire for Peace will show itself with all possible strength, but the time limit is short; "Let us not repeat the mistakes of E.D.C.", said M. Mendes-France, showing his wish to move quickly; it is this haste which makes our fight more difficult and thereby more urgent. Your friendship gives us the task of telling you that the hour is late, very late; we must take heed of it. It is a question of the future and even of the lives of our peoples. By our common efforts we shall be able to win a new success. It is upon us Frenchmen, but also upon all of you, especially those of you who represent the peoples of Western Europe, that the future of Peace and of the world depends.



DR. E. H. S. BURHOP

No. 2 / 0

(Great Britain)

MH

Action of peace forces to secure disarmament  
and the prohibition of weapons of mass  
destruction

The questions of disarmament and the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction have been a major preoccupation of the World Peace Movement ever since its inception. It is particularly appropriate that we should return to discuss them today since it was as a result of a similar meeting in this great city four years ago that the great mass movement against these horror weapons was launched. Stockholm has very many things of which its citizens can be proud - its beautiful architecture, its commercial and cultural traditions - but I would venture to guess that future citizens of Stockholm will take particular pride in the association of its name with the Stockholm Appeal which so captured the imagination of the people of the world. Some 500 million people of every colour, nationality, race and creed joined in affixing their signatures to this document calling for the banning of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction. The whole of recorded history knows no previous example of any such unanimity among peoples of all countries. That mighty movement spread out from this city and caught the imagination of ordinary people everywhere as it swept round the world. Where-as previously men of goodwill whose better nature cried out against the use of these weapons felt frustrated, powerless, isolated, now they began to feel conscious of their strength. They were able to



(Great Britain)

MH

see that these weapons were not inflicted on the world by some uncontrollable destiny imposed from without, but were designed by men, built by men, and their use was in the power of man to decide. And although one man here, another there, a few more somewhere else could do nothing effective to prevent their use, no politician in any country throughout the world could afford to flout the combined will of 500 million people from all countries.

The peace movement won its maturity and self-confidence in the great campaign for the success of the Stockholm Appeal. And the fruits of the success of the Appeal were soon to be made manifest. When, in December 1950, certain American military leaders, faced with the failure of the plans to occupy the whole of Korea, demanded the right to unleash atomic weapons against the cities of North Korea and China, and when President Truman hesitated on the brink before making the fateful decision, it was the strength of the opinion of the people of the world, and not least, I take pride in saying, of the people of Great Britain, that sent the former British Prime Minister, Mr. Attlee, flying across the Atlantic to warn the American President of the grave consequences that would certainly follow the use of these weapons.

Since then the Peace Movement has had many successes. The combined will of the people for peace has forced an armistice in Korea, stopped the fighting in Indo-China and led to the discrediting of Dulles' so-called "New Look" policy of massive



DR. E.H.S. BURHOP  
(Great Britain)

-3 -

No. 2 / 0  
BS.

as it does it will make for tension and discord. Western politicians are still determined to put arms in the hands of the former Nazi generals. And over all hangs the threat of even more terrible and nauseating weapons of mass destruction.

The nature of these weapons was made clear for all to see after the effects of the hydrogen bomb exploded in the Marshall Islands on March 1st became known to the world. Peaceful Japanese fishermen, going about their lawful pursuits on the high seas, trying to extract a hard-earned livelihood from the ocean, were suddenly enveloped in a rain of death from the skies. Parts of the coral atoll of Bikini where the United States authorities had exploded an H-bomb had been vaporised by the intense heat, rendered radioactive by exposure to the intense concentration of neutrons in the bomb, and then spread far and wide over an area of many thousands of square miles. It was the radioactive calcium and strontium dust from Bikini that now covered the deck of the tiny fishing smack 90 miles away. Twenty-three of the fishermen were seriously affected. One has died. But the anguish of these poor folk has not been in vain. They, the first victims of the hydrogen bomb, have, even in their suffering, made plain to the people of the whole world the nature of the new weapons. It has since come to light that several hundreds of the inhabitants of adjacent Pacific islands were similarly injured. The object lesson of the fiendish effectiveness of the H-bomb has strengthened enormously the demand for the complete abolition of these weapons.



(Great Britain)

MH

even in their suffering, made plain to the people of the whole world the nature of the new weapons. It has since come to light that several hundreds of the inhabitants of adjacent Pacific island were similarly injured. The object lesson of the fiendish effectiveness of the H-bomb has strengthened enormously the demand for the complete abolition of these weapons.

And, appropriately enough, in no country was the reaction more immediate and immense than in Japan itself. The Japanese people who had suffered so terribly from the explosions of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were now the first to feel the effects of these new weapons, a thousand times more destructive than the original atomic bombs. I think we should pay a special tribute today to the brave fighters for peace in the Japanese Peace movement who have so energetically and single-mindedly sought to turn the public wave of revulsion against these weapons into a constructive demand for their abolition. Over 25 million signatures, one in every four of the whole population, have been obtained for their petition demanding the banning of these weapons and an end to the tests.

But it was not only in Japan that the lesson of Bikini created a profound impression. In Britain too the implications of the new weapons were clear for all to see. How could any part of Britain feel safe against the effect of a weapon that produces complete and utter devastation over



(Great Britain)

an area of 150 square miles, very grave structural damage to buildings over an area of 600 square miles, that will kindle destructive fires over an area of 1,200 square miles, that will engulf an area of 30,000 square miles with dust so radioactive as completely to destroy all living things, man, beast, insect or plant? It required no very complicated arithmetic to prove that a single bomb of this type exploded over London would probably kill four million people outright and leave another four million trapped, to perish in the mighty conflagration that would certainly follow the bomb. More millions would certainly die later from the effect of the radio-active contamination spread over so vast an area.

A wide-spread public outcry embracing all sections of the British people and press opinion resulted in immediate action in Parliament. On the initiative of Mr. Attlee a unanimous resolution was passed in the House of Commons calling for the earliest meeting of the leading statesmen of the Great Powers to discuss anew the problem of disarmament. The Trades Union Congress, meeting at Brighton, after hearing a moving speech from one of Britain's greatest atomic physicist, Nobel laureate, Professor C. F. Powell, unanimously passed a resolution calling for a ban on nuclear weapons. Innumerable trade union branches, Co-operative guilds, political party branches, local organisations, all over Britain from the



(Great Britain)

largest cities to some of the tiniest hamlets have discussed these matters and carried resolutions along similar lines.

No action has caught the imagination of wide circles of the British people more than that of the Coventry City Council. This council has courageously refused to co-operate in the elaborate sham civil defence which they were asked to support. They found they were being called upon to spend money in building a civil defence control centre above ground and of a similar type and in a similar position to the one that had been destroyed within twenty minutes of the start of the Nazi attack on Coventry in 1940. The council has been reviled and has had subsidies withdrawn but still it has maintained its position. Indeed it has pointed the way to a much better method of protecting its people from the perils of nuclear warfare. It approached the council of a similar industrial city of Stalingrad and suggested a joint declaration calling for the banning of nuclear weapons to be drawn up by the elected leaders of the two cities. A delegation from the Coventry City Council, including the Lord Mayor, has recently visited Stalingrad and a joint appeal to the people of the world and the United Nations has been made.

In all countries the public conscience has been stirred. Resolutions against these weapons have come from all parts; from Sydney to Stockholm, from Buenos Aires to Berlin, from Peking to Paris, from Detroit to Delhi. And indeed this



(Great Britain)

is natural. The most striking characteristic of the threat of nuclear weapons is the universality of that threat. Some countries, such as my own, may perhaps feel in particular danger owing to their geographical situation or to the density of their populations. But everybody, whether he live in the most technically advanced, or the most primitive community, faces a common danger. After all, it would only need a thousand or so bombs of the type used on Bikini on March 1st of this year, exploded in a special way, by surrounding them with a shell of the metal cobalt, - and the level of radio-activity would become so high over the whole world that it would completely destroy all life.

But a great task still confronts the British Peace movement as indeed the Peace movements in all countries. Agreement has not been reached on the banning of these weapons. Day in, day out, they are still being produced. In spite of the unanimous resolution of the British House of Commons referred to above, the leading statesmen have not yet met and Sir Winston Churchill is still very vague about when he plans to take the initiative to try to arrange such a meeting. We cannot, we dare not rest, until agreement has been reached on this issue. Every day's delay increases the difficulty of the problem technically, politically, and from a military point of view.



(Great Britain)

From a technical point of view agreement is rendered more difficult by delay because the greater the size of the stocks of these weapons the harder it becomes to control them. Control of the means of production of nuclear weapons is relatively straight forward, largely because of the substantial size of the plants needed for their production. But control of the finished products is much more difficult because stock piles of nuclear weapons need not take much space to store and could escape detection by a control agency.

From a military point of view delay makes control more difficult because military planning revolves more and more around the use of these weapons. Already they are being issued as tactical weapons to the forces of N.A.T.O. Indeed, the leading military spokesmen of N.A.T.O. (Grunther, Montgomery) far from trying to hide the extent to which their plans are based on the use of the most revolting nuclear weapons, openly speak about it. Thus in a speech that shocked many in Britain, Montgomery stated recently: "We at S.H.A.P.E. are basing all our operational planning on using atomic and thermo-nuclear weapons in our defence. With us it is no longer a question of 'they may possibly be used'. It is very definitely a question of 'they will be used if we are attacked.'" Thus he implied that in the event



(Great Britain)

of war the N.A.T.O. forces are prepared to be the first to use atomic weapons. And yet in the same speech he said: "There is no sound civil defence organisation on the territory of any N.A.T.O. nation so far as I know." No wonder the noted British military writer, Liddell Hart, felt constrained to say in a letter to The Times after Montgomery's speech: "The logic of this lecture will hardly inspire confidence in the heads of S.H.A.P.E. or the people they represent."

But from a political point of view the danger of delay in securing agreement on disarmament and the control of these weapons is gravest of all. We all envisage how profoundly the rearmament of Germany is likely to affect thinking on all questions related to disarmament. An entirely new factor will be injected into the discussions. How will we be able to go to the people of France, of Britain, of Belgium, of Holland, of Poland, of Czechoslovakia, of the U.S.S.R. and advocate they should all reduce their arms, destroy nuclear weapons, at precisely the same time as the former Nazi generals are again getting back their arms and getting access to nuclear weapons? Our two great campaigns for the defeat of German rearmament and for general disarmament and the banning of nuclear weapons are really two aspects of the same campaign. That is why it is so terribly urgent to see that agreement is reached.



(Great Britain)

A           And agreement can be reached on these issues. Only a few weeks ago we saw at New York the first show of unanimity for eight years between the Great Powers on a matter of substance. And this show of unanimity came on this very issue of disarmament and the abolition of nuclear weapons. As a result, we saw Great Britain, France, the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union jointly sponsoring a resolution calling for the continuation of the discussions between them in the sub-committee of the United Nations Disarmament Committee on an agreed basis. The important point is that this resolution only received joint sponsorship by the four powers after compromises had been made by both the Western Powers and the Soviet Union. Far be it from me to under-estimate the difficulties that still remain before agreement on disarmament is achieved. But if the same spirit of compromise prevails in the sub-committee discussion, agreement can be reached.

          There is no doubt that some change in the atmosphere of discussions can be discerned. But one of the key factors contributing to this change has indubitably been the strength of the popular revulsion against weapons of mass destruction that has been mobilised by the Peace movement. Equally clearly the spirit of compromise will continue to flourish only if we keep alive in the minds of the politicians



the awareness of this revulsion. We must be vigilant about the course of negotiations and if they run into difficulties we must take the trouble to get clear in our own minds the real source of the difficulties so that we can explain to the people in all our countries the matters at issue and try to point the way forward. I fear we have largely failed in this matter during the eight long years of deadlock that have persisted over the control of atomic energy in the United Nations Organisation.

The course of negotiation has been complex. It requires some effort to get quite clear on the real issues in dispute and too often with all the other pressing issues facing us we have not been as careful as we should have been to size up the true facts of the position. This has made it possible for the grossest misrepresentation of the attitude of the various countries to the question of atomic energy control to gain public credence.

One popular misconception in Britain has been that throughout the negotiations on atomic energy control the reason for the lack of success has been the refusal of the Soviet Government to agree to inspection. This impression has gained ground as a result of grossly misleading statements by politicians who must have known better and these statements have been featured in the press in a way that supports the theory of Soviet intransigence.



For example, on 22nd March 1950 in referring in the House of Commons to the Soviet attitude to the international control of atomic energy, the late Foreign Secretary, Mr. Ernest Bevin, stated: "If a country will not open its doors for inspectors, what is the use of entering into an agreement when it is not known whether it will be kept?" This statement was reported in the press to mean that the Soviet Government would not agree to inspection, and yet it was well known, and certainly Mr. Bevin must have known that in June 1947 a most elaborate and potentially effective system of inspection had been proposed by the Soviet Government.

Another impression that has been sedulously fostered is that the Soviet Government would only agree to international control of atomic energy provided America first destroyed all her stocks of atomic weapons and agreed not to make any more. It was hinted that this was all part of a cunning scheme to make the Western Powers relinquish their most prized weapons, while the Soviet Government maintained its army at as high a strength as ever and that there was no guarantee once the atomic weapons had been destroyed that the U.S.S.R. would ever agree to the control scheme functioning.

The way this misrepresentation has gained ground is seen from the statement of the Diplomatic Correspondent of The Times on May 8th 1954, who wrote: "The Soviet view hitherto has been that there should be..... a prohibition of atomic weapons and only then discussions towards an



international control of fissionable material". The Times declined to publish a correction of this statement, even when it was pointed out to them that ever since 1948 Soviet policy has called for the simultaneous coming-into-force of conventions leading to the prohibition of atomic weapons and the setting up of a mechanism of strict international control, neither convention coming into force until both were ready to operate. A similar interpretation of Soviet policy was given by the Diplomatic Correspondent of the Observer in an article of October 3rd, 1954, and they too refused to publish a correction.

I mention these points not in order to stir up past controversies, but to show how easy it is for the great majority of people to get erroneous and misleading ideas about the course of negotiations in such a complicated field as disarmament and the control of atomic weapons.

It may perhaps be helpful at this stage to summarise the differences that have held up agreements on the question of the control of nuclear weapons during the past eight years.

In the first place there has been a difference about the aim of any control scheme. The Soviet view has been that the aims should be to secure the absolute banning of these weapons and that the production of these weapons should cease immediately and the dismantling of existing stocks should be completed within a few months of the coming into force of the control plan.



**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.