

Eq 7-5-14

*Spa Chamber Speech*

~~54(38)~~ ①

38(10)  
EUROPEAN SECURITY

*Spa*  
E 231

For the first time our labours are unattended by the sinister accompaniment of shells and bombs. This is to be reckoned to the credit of all the partisans of peace. Remember how we started: the howls of some, the jeers of others, the sceptical silence of yet more. Five years of self-sacrificing effort - from door to door, from house to house - have changed the climate of the world. We declared that the Five Great Powers should sit round a table. "A Utopia", we were answered by the would-be realists. "That shall never be", swore the partisans of the policy of strength. Very well, we have seen the Utopias made real. Albeit reluctantly, albeit on the very edge of their chairs, even those who cried "never" yet sat at the Geneva table. And in this, as in everything else, the most important of all is the beginning.

Certainly the partisans of the policy of strength have not renounced their aims. They do their utmost to divide and scare the peoples. They do their utmost. But now, already, that most is not so much. Is the Manila Pact capable of eclipsing, in the minds of the peoples of Asia, the whole meaning of the Geneva Conference? Have the London and Paris Conferences the power to cross out the shameful finish of the "European Defence Community"? Is this or that advocate of the policy of strength, be he ever so talkative, be his voice ever so loud, able to stifle the sober words of the leaders of India? The policy of strength is become somewhat tarnished: the policy remains, the strength declines.

Our affirmation of the indispensability of the peaceful co-existence of states with differing social systems begins to penetrate into the consciousness of the most backward citizens of the most politically backward countries. Scientists of sufficient authority have warned the peoples that, in the epoch of thermonuclear weapons, world war can lead to mass destruction. If it be sometimes difficult to convince people in the grip of greed, hate or fear that murder is a wrongful act, yet it is a great deal easier to convince them it is foolishness to resort to suicide. Not long ago a United States statesman remarked that on the whole he inclines to the idea of peaceful co-existence, only he does not like the phrase, because we use it such a lot, so he proposes to speak of peaceful co-habitation. Though I, as a writer, am the readier to stand meticulously on a choice of words, we shall not start a quarrel of expressions. I shall only pursue to their conclusion the thoughts of this American statesman. The possibility of peaceful co-existence is A, B and C. The peoples now want more. We must demand not only the renunciation of world blood-letting, but, further, the participation of all states, whatever their social structure, in the resolution

6231

Ilya EHRENBURG

- 3 -

No. 10 ST

would at once collapse. Consequently, either wholly naive or not wholly sincere are those persons who promise that the arming of Western Germany and its inclusion in a military bloc will in no wise hinder the peaceful co-existence of the Western Powers and the Soviet Union.

The propaganda of fear and hate is a dangerous affair, it is akin to those radio-active poisons that are not subject to control. It poisons the climate of Europe and may, even contrary to the will of one or other Government, lead to conflict. The like is true of the arms race, which is born of the policy of military blocs. "Armed Peace" has not once only led Europe to war. For every unprejudiced person can understand that the more bombers, tanks and soldiers there are about, the more real the peril that the readied weapons and the organised divisions will be given the word to march. It is impossible to achieve a lessening of international tension by increasing armaments, one excludes the other. And yet we see supporters of the policy of strength addressing one conference on their drive to relax international tension, then immediately hastening to another, there to argue that it is indispensable to increase armaments and, above all, to rearm that country which so recently with its arms laid waste the majority of European states.

The arming of Western Germany and its inclusion in a military bloc not only cannot square with measures to promote peaceful co-existence or peaceful co-habitation - they will create a new position, a new threat to Europe and the whole world. It is now clear to all that the arms race is a misfortune for any people, and that before every State arises the question how arms may be reduced. We must support any reasonable proposal, from whomsoever it may come, for reducing armaments, for gradually disarming the states that possess armies. This is no distant aim, but a task of the present day. But can the arming of Western Germany constitute a stage on the road to general disarmament? Of course not, and Edouard Herriot was a hundred times right when he reminded his fellow citizens that Peace cannot be found on the road to war.

The history of the last 80 years has demonstrated that, despite pretty adequate records of belligerency scored by the governments of certain other European states, the champions' laurels for launching war belong to the German militarists and the bosses of German industry. Surely it cannot be possible that now, when not yet ten years have passed since the conclusion of the late atrocious war, the defence of Peace can have left to it only one path - the revival of the Wehrmacht and the arsenal of the Ruhr? According to the conception of the partisans of the policy of strength, the German divisions must be a trump in the card game, and in case this dangerous game should end unhappily, be converted into cannon fodder. But the cunning conjurer may easily find himself in the position of a marionette. As is known, the

8231

Ilya EHRENBURG

- 3 -

No. 10 ST

would at once collapse. Consequently, either wholly naive or not wholly sincere are those persons who promise that the arming of Western Germany and its inclusion in a military bloc will in no wise hinder the peaceful co-existence of the Western Powers and the Soviet Union.

The propaganda of fear and hate is a dangerous affair, it is akin to those radio-active poisons that are not subject to control. It poisons the climate of Europe and may, even contrary to the will of one or other Government, lead to conflict. The like is true of the arms race, which is born of the policy of military blocs. "Armed Peace" has not once only led Europe to war. For every unprejudiced person can understand that the more bombers, tanks and soldiers there are about, the more real the peril that the readied weapons and the organised divisions will be given the word to march. It is impossible to achieve a lessening of international tension by increasing armaments, one excludes the other. And yet we see supporters of the policy of strength addressing one conference on their drive to relax international tension, then immediately hastening to another, there to argue that it is indispensable to increase armaments and, above all, to rearm that country which so recently with its arms laid waste the majority of European states.

The arming of Western Germany and its inclusion in a military bloc not only cannot square with measures to promote peaceful co-existence or peaceful co-habitation - they will create a new position, a new threat to Europe and the whole world. It is now clear to all that the arms race is a misfortune for any people, and that before every State arises the question how arms may be reduced. We must support any reasonable proposal, from whomsoever it may come, for reducing armaments, for gradually disarming the states that possess armies. This is no distant aim, but a task of the present day. But can the arming of Western Germany constitute a stage on the road to general disarmament? Of course not, and Edouard Herriot was a hundred times right when he reminded his fellow citizens that Peace cannot be found on the road to war.

The history of the last 80 years has demonstrated that, despite pretty adequate records of belligerency scored by the governments of certain other European states, the champions' laurels for launching war belong to the German militarists and the bosses of German industry. Surely it cannot be possible that now, when not yet ten years have passed since the conclusion of the late atrocious war, the defence of Peace can have left to it only one path - the revival of the Wehrmacht and the arsenal of the Ruhr? According to the conception of the partisans of the policy of strength, the German divisions must be a trump in the card game, and in case this dangerous game should end unhappily, be converted into cannon fodder. But the cunning conjurer may easily find himself in the position of a marionette. As is known, the

8231

Ilya EHRENBURG  
U.S.S.R.

- 4 -

No. 10 ST

government of West Germany stubbornly refuses to recognise the present frontiers, and thereby openly places a war of revenge upon its programme. Suppose in Europe there were to exist two mutually hostile groups, the German revanchists would be in a position to provoke a military conflict and draw into it their new partners. In 1939 the French worshippers of Hitler, when he wanted to join Danzig to the Reich by force, shouted: "Should we die for Danzig?" Now the French worshippers of Chancellor Adenauer lightmindedly acclaim an agreement which may send Frenchmen, in the space of one year or a few years, to their deaths to return Danzig to the Reich.

We have said, and we repeat, that the arming of Western Germany will render impossible the reunification of Germany. This is clear to everyone, and if we are shyly silent on this subject certain Frenchmen who not so long ago came out against the "European Defence Community" but now agree to stomach this obviously incredible dish so long as it is steeped in English sauce, yet bluntly frank upon the matter is United States Senator Flanders, "I don't reckon it possible to unify Germany by way of rearmament unless by way of World War No.3.", said he. That then can result from arming Western Germany, including it in a Western military bloc and refusal of its peaceful unification. It is entirely possible that in the imagination of many Germans who have not yet given up the myths with which they have lived these many years, the restoration of a United Germany is bound up with dreams of military victory. And, that, indeed, means that very World War No.3. that imperils every continent. The revival of German militarism threatens every people in Europe, the Germans among their number. Why, indeed, protest against the London agreement so many political figures renounce from any sympathy with the German Democratic Republic: Devan and the Christian Democrat Melloni, Ollenhauser and the Belgian Senator Rollin? As for France, her feelings were well described by the Paris correspondent of the "New York Times": "No bridegroom obliged to undergo a shot-gun wedding ever showed such reluctance as France showed this week in agreeing to the entry of Germany into the Western Military Alliance."

The supporters of the policy of strength have led the states of Western Europe into an impasse of contradictions. I dwell on France not just because I know and love that country. No blind man now but understands her role in the past, present and future of Europe. It is hard to decide a single European problem without reckoning with the will of France, and this arises not only from her geographical position, but also from her history, from the creative genius of her people. We well know that this people sincerely desires peace, and it is no accident that from the very inception of our movement, Frenchmen have been its inspirers and its spokesmen.

8 231

- 5 -

Ilya Ehrenburg.  
U.S. S.R.

No.10.

We know likewise the difficulties that France faces in trying to preserve herself and Europe from a new war. All peoples have acclaimed the historical gesture of the French Parliament that put paid to the "European Defence Community". What, however, now propose to France the paladins of the London agreement? That same division of Europe into two mutually hostile camps, that same division of Germany, already condemned by the Parliament of France. It is easy to understand the confusion of some of the statesmen of that country. They are participating in the organisation of a military alliance that is directed against the Soviet Union. At the same time they fear not a Soviet attack but the German revanchists. It is proposed to include in a military bloc, in which they themselves are to be participants, German divisions. Naturally, the statesmen of France have long been asking for "guarantees" - in vain they have sought safety not from those against whom the military alliance is directed, but from their own new and unwelcome allies. Desiring to explain such contradictions to their fellow citizens, and may be also to themselves, the statesmen of France speak of "loyalty to previously assumed obligations". Is it possible, however, to be loyal to one set of obligations and ignore others? There exists an agreement, beneath which stands the signature of France, directed against any threat of the revival of German militarism. This agreement envisages, at any moment of crisis, consultations between France and the Soviet Union. Being loyal to previously assumed obligations, France, while conducting conversations on the revival of the Wehrmacht, should have proposed to the Soviet Union examination of the threat created with her agreement. Please excuse me, if this sounds like a joke - I only wanted, in speaking of France, to be, if only, slightly, a Cartesian. I am, of course, convinced that France will contrive to emerge from "the impasse", and that her will to peace will show her a course worthy of her. Re-calling the phrase of the "New York Times" correspondent about the shot-gun and the bridegroom, I think that maybe some match-makers have been precipitate with the wedding programme. Much yet depends on the French people. This summer in an American newspaper France was called "the land of big disappointments". For the supporters of Peace, in whatsoever corner of the world, France was, is and will be a land of great hopes and great possibilities.

People who, sincerely or reluctantly, defend the London agreements say that there is no other way out for Western Europe, that the Soviet Union does not want a United Germany and refuses all proposals for free elections. The partisans of peace must in every country, on every street corner, in every home, denounce this familiar-pattern lie of the enemies of peace. The Soviet Union has proclaimed that it seeks the unification of Germany, it proposes conversations

8-231

with the three Western Powers and is agreeable to examine Western proposals of free elections in Germany. Why then is its offer to this day not accepted? Why, instead of negotiations with their allies in the war against German militarism, do some French Radicals and some British Labourites prefer to rearm S.S. men, revive the Wehrmacht and repeat the tragicomedy that led to the second World War? Maybe their arguments are serious that "Its hard to agree with the Russians", that "The Berlin Conference chilled everybod y's hopes", that "its silly to waste time in useless talk", that "the Russians make use of conferences for their propaganda". But the Russians might well say that, because they find it hard to agree with the Americans, they don't want to talk. Nevertheless, they propose negotiation. And the Berlin Conference may well have chilled not only Parisians but Muscovites too, yet all the same the Soviet Union insists that negotiation is the only reasonable road. I understand that the Ministers of the Western Powers are busy people, but so likewise are Soviet Ministers with pretty considerable loads of work. Of course for Mr. Eden or Mons. Mendes-France it is not easy to spend a few weeks negotiating, but it might be asked which is more important, to save a few weeks work for the four Ministers and their staffs or the lives of many million people? And as regards propaganda - the point is simply incomprehensible. For there speak at diplomatic conferences not only Soviet representatives, but also those of the West, and moreover the Western ones are three. If putting one's arguments is to be called "propaganda", then the Western Powers too have the opportunity for propaganda, and trebly so. Maybe some representatives of the West reckon that it is better fro. their point of view not to outline their arguments before world public opinion, so as not to give the Soviet delegates the opportunity to reply? But this would hardly correspond with the principles officially supported by the Western powers. I profoundly believe that discussion must precede agreement. And, therefore, the peoples must oblige the governments of the Four Powers immediately to begin conversations on the peaceful unification of Germany, and remember, that such conversations will hardly be possible while beneath the windows march the resurrected divisions of the Wehrmacht. Neither military blocs nor an armed Germany can safeguard the future for the cornfields and the children of Europe. It is necessary to find another path - a new path, the path of peace. The Soviet Government proposes the calling of a conference of all European States, with participation of the representative of the United States, and an examination in common how together to ensure the security of Europe. Any participant in this conference may propose his plan, from such an examination in common must emerge some concrete and acceptable-to-all agreement. To wait longer is impossible. The time has come to call on all European states to co-operate, regardless of the principles that guide their internal policy. The representatives of all European States can and must agree on the organisation of collective security. As participant in this union should be included likewise the United States of America, because twice it has happened that she has been dragged into a war begun in Europe, and because the American people has close economic ties with many of the peoples of Western Europe.

6731

A Frenchman, a reader of "Figaro", extremely cold towards the Soviet Union but, at the same time, depressed by the dependent and precarious situation of his country, once said to me: "We Frenchmen dream of a guarantee of our security such that beneath it would stand the signatures of U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R." I think we must appreciate the feeling underlying this saying and expressing the longing of many inhabitants of Western European countries, Union of Europe for her security - not "little Europe", but all European states, a union with which America is associated would give substance to the dream of the "Figaro" reader. Under the guarantee of the security of France and actually of every other European state, among the many signatures would stand the signatures of the United States and the Soviet Union. This union, certainly, must be based on the full sovereignty of each participant, without the hegemony of any one power or group of powers - Luxembourg has the same right to respect of its independence as Great Britain or the Soviet Union. This union for the aim of common security would allow the peoples to breathe peacefully, put an end to war psychosis, and lead to general disarmament. The co-operation of the states of Europe would enable the overcoming of the stagnation now reflected harmfully in the economic and cultural state of every European country.

On the peoples of Europe it now depends how the governments make answer to the proposals to safeguard security of all states and open the way to an era of real peace. Our session is gathered together in days that may decide the future of Europe and the whole of humanity. The peoples may yet avert the supreme misfortune. The peoples may yet avert the splitting of Europe and a new arms race. The peoples must not allow the spectre of war to be unconcerned anew in the very heart of Europe. We see the confusion of the statesmen of certain countries who, the while they speak of negotiation and peaceful co-existence, sign treaties for the revival of the Wehrmacht - that evil genius of Europe. They hurry too much when the talk is of peaceful co-existence. They have lost their self control. But there is yet the control of the people. It is to the peoples indeed, that we must turn, we, the defenders of Peace.

Allow me to finish this speech with a few words of a personal character. I speak as a Soviet citizen, a Russian writer, a man who has lived through two world wars, who has seen the ashes of Rhims and Novgorod, a European loving Europe, devoted to it, on whose lips are often these splendid words Herzen on "The sacred stones of Europe" and in these decisive days I want to say to all Europeans: preserve the beautiful that is our heritage, defend the future, save Europe from fire and tears, build Peace! Every day is precious. Friends, remember what we pledged in the past, here in this lovely city. From here went our Appeal, that maybe

6231

Ilya EHRENBURG  
U.S.S.R.

- 8 -

No. 10 ST

saved the world from the horror of the atomic bomb. Then we were feeble: now the stream has turned into a broad river. With us, now, is the public opinion of the entire world. But we must rouse in our hearts the fire of old. We must find the passion of the days of the Stockholm Appeal. Do not let the irreparable come to pass. Protect the road to Peace!

*Handwritten notes:*  
...  
...  
...  
(8E) 46  
23/1/53



**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.