

**NINE QUESTIONS  
AND ANSWERS  
ABOUT DISARMAMENT**

HX

632

A1

W9

NO. 538

ENCY

EX LIBRIS  
UNIVERSITATIS  
ALBERTAENSIS



**NINE  
QUESTIONS  
AND ANSWERS  
ABOUT DISARMAMENT**

NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY  
Moscow 1962

LIBRARY  
UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Peaceful coexistence or thermonuclear war—that is the alternative facing mankind today. And hundreds of millions of people say “NO!” to world war.

But how to guarantee security and durable peace on our planet? The best way is general and complete disarmament, for it rules out force in the settlement of international issues. A world without arms is a world without wars.

Many scientists, newspapermen, statesmen, politicians and religious leaders devote their knowledge, energy, and research to this deserving cause. Exhaustive scientific works and brief newspaper articles are dedicated to it.

There are very many different aspects to the disarmament problem—political, social, economic, historical, etc. We cannot examine them all in a small pamphlet, and confine ourselves, therefore, to just the one problem of how disarmament will affect the economic, material and cultural life of the peoples.

A Novosti Press Agency (APN) correspondent has requested a group of Soviet scientists to state their views on the economic consequences of general and complete disarmament. Their answers follow.

**APN Correspondent: What will the Soviet people gain economically from general and complete disarmament?**

**P. Mstislavsky**, department head, Economics Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.:

The annual armaments expenditures of all countries aggregate \$120,000 million. This is roughly equal to one-half of the annual world outlay on capital construction.

The Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union stresses that it is the goal of the Soviet Union to

ensure conditions of peace for building communist society in the U.S.S.R. and, at the same time, for delivering mankind from another destructive world war. This is why the Soviet Union has put forward repeated proposals for general and complete disarmament.

The Soviet proposals envisage that after general and complete disarmament will have been effected in the U.S.S.R. and other countries, only a small contingent of militia is to be retained to maintain public order and ensure the safety of citizens. A staff of inspectors is to be maintained to control the performance by the various states of their disarmament obligations. A certain effort will also be required for aerial inspection and photography. However, as far as the Soviet Union is concerned, all these measures will involve no more than 100,000 men and an annual expenditure of not more than 300 million rubles.

Consequently, general and complete disarmament will mean a saving of approximately 14,000 million rubles, and will release at least 3.5 million men for employment in the national economy. Then take military property, a certain part of which may be used directly for civilian purposes.

If 10 to 20 per cent of the released resources are allocated for economic assistance to the underdeveloped countries, an additional 10,000-11,000 million rubles a year will still remain for the country's domestic needs.

How will these resources be distributed and what benefits will the Soviet people derive from them? In our opinion, there are two possible variants. The first is to put the additional resources proportionally into the various trends envisaged in the national economic plan. The second is to put them into trends where the need for additional means is the most acute and where they will yield a relatively higher benefit, with the proviso, of course, that the necessary proportions in the national economy are not upset. We think the second variant to be more desirable, though much harder to calculate. Yet we can make a series of conjectures on that score, based on tentative computations.

Disarmament will enable us to convert to civilian production the metal-working and engineering plants now producing armaments. It is difficult to estimate the probable effect of such a conversion, but rough forecasts are feasible. We believe, for example, that engineering facilities handling military orders may be used to manufacture annually several hundred thousand additional motor vehicles of various types. Shipyards could be made to produce additionally dozens of passenger liners and hundreds of thousands of launches and motor boats.

Conversion of engineering plants exclusively to civilian production would also considerably expand the output of durable goods. All radio-engineering plants, for instance, would switch to television and radio sets.

Then, the most important thing. The engineering industry is the spine of all the other industries. By relieving the engineering industry of war production, disarmament would give a new and powerful impetus to the development of the Soviet economy, and primarily of the consumer industries. Up-to-date machines, progressive technology, and highly skilled personnel—these are some of the advantages to be derived from the switch-over of the engineering industry to civilian production only.

Disarmament will enable us to increase the output of mineral fertilisers and pest-killers, which will add to the output of foods and industrial crops, and help create an abundance of consumer goods.

We estimate that given total disarmament, it would be desirable to invest an additional 2,500-3,000 million rubles in the next two or three years in the light industry and the branches supplying it with raw materials and semi-processed goods. These additional resources could be used to build dozens of big textile, garment and shoe factories. Greater output of fabrics and footwear would be attended by price reductions.

Well-appointed housing for every Soviet family is an important element in the improvement of the living standard.

Disarmament would enable us to allocate additionally some 3,000 million rubles a year for housing and municipal improvement. In four or five years this would add up to approximately 12,000-15,000 million rubles, increasing the housing programme by all of one-third. In other words, 800,000-1,000,000 more families and single men and women would get new comfortable housing each year. This is equivalent to building 11-14 towns with a population of 200,000-250,000 each.

All in all, additional post-disarmament civilian production would increase the supply of consumer goods in the country by at least 3,000-4,000 million rubles a year.

The Seven-Year Plan provides for a 62 per cent increase in retail sales between 1959 and 1965, and disarmament would ensure an additional 5-7 per cent rise.

Disarmament would have an immense impact on the further development of education and public health.

Irrespective of disarmament, the number of hospital beds in the current seven-year period will increase 40 per cent, the number of kindergartens and nurseries will more than double and the enrolment in boarding-schools will increase 14-fold.

If disarmament were effected, some boarding-schools could be established in the former military school buildings, which have class-rooms, hostels, auxiliary premises, dining-rooms, gymnasiums, etc. Their conversion would considerably expand the network of educational establishments at a relatively low cost.

Some of the buildings now occupied by military establishments could at a minimum cost be turned into hospitals, yielding several hundred thousand additional beds. Furthermore, the medical personnel now serving in the armed forces could be employed in the public health services. Disarmament would also enable the government to allocate additionally some 2,500 million rubles for increasing the pensions.

To sum up the aggregate increase in material benefits to be derived from complete disarmament, the total would



amount to at least 10 per cent of the present volume of all benefits. Moreover, it would ensure a higher rate of growth of the people's living standard than envisaged in earlier plans.

Disarmament would enable us to reduce the working week and lengthen paid vacations ahead of the present programme. Nor should we lose sight of this other important factor that many young men, called up for military service, spend three to four years in military training, and millions of regular servicemen in all countries dedicate themselves to the perfection of military techniques and the art of war. The abilities and energy of these men, applied to creative labour in the national economy, would yield great benefits to society. The Soviet economy would not only get additional highly skilled personnel for its industry and agriculture, but also excellently trained specialists and researchers.

In addition, general disarmament would be instrumental in speeding the solution of many scientific problems in physics, chemistry, biology, medicine, etc., for peaceful purposes.

**APN Correspondent: How does the arms drive affect the average family budget?**

**I. Zlobin, D. Sc. (Econ.),** professor of the Institute of Finance:

There are no precise statistical data on how much of an average family budget is nibbled away by military expenditure, just as there are no data on the average family budget itself in different countries computed by a common, generally accepted scientific method. All available data are no more than assumed. They are rather the result of estimates.

Yet they are quite sufficient to give an idea of the colossal burden upon the family budget of the continued arms drive in all countries. It may be recalled that total expenditure on wars and their preparation during the first half of this century exceeded \$4,000,000 million—a sum sufficient to provide the entire population of the globe with free bread for half a century and build comfortable dwellings for 500 million families.

The immediate source of these expenditures is the budget of states, 80-96 per cent of whose revenue in the capitalist countries comes from taxes (direct and indirect) levied on the population.

That is why in his message to Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, of October 15, 1959, N. S. Khrushchov pointed out, among other things, that "if we refuse to improve relations with states adhering to a different ideology, in practice . . . this would mean playing into the hands of those who want to screw down the tax press endlessly and continue with the precipitous armaments race. . . ."

People who know little of economics and finance may ask whether it is true that the arms drive is so directly and closely linked with the *tax press*, and whether its elimination will rid the peoples of the *insufferable tax burden*.

Yes, the link between the arms drive and the tax press really exists.

Take the example of the U.S.A.—the richest and most developed capitalist country, where direct military expenditures amount to \$55,000 million and where most of the budget revenue is derived from taxes, and mostly taxes from the population. The net revenue in the 1958/59 U.S. Federal budget was \$68,200 million, of which \$65,600 million, or more than 96 per cent, was derived from taxes, with taxes from the population accounting for \$51,500 million, or about 80 per cent.

Much the same situation obtains in Federal Germany, where the 1959/60 Federal budget was nearly 40,000 million marks, with 80 per cent of the revenue being taxes (32,000 million marks), the bulk of which came from the working people.

It is only natural that this should affect the budget of an average family. According to estimates made by bourgeois economists, direct and indirect taxes reduce family budgets by approximately 30 per cent. But the true figure is somewhat higher.

It should be noted that each year more and more population groups in the capitalist countries fall under the tax

press. In the past 20 years the number of income-tax payers in the U.S.A. increased from 4 to 50 million, chiefly at the expense of working people. Thus, in the 15 years from 1943/44 to 1958/59, the total Federal income tax in the U.S.A. increased 140 per cent, and the income tax on wages and salaries 310 per cent.

The arms drive brings down the living standard of the masses in the capitalist countries by devouring colossal resources which could be used to satisfy their vital requirements. In 1958, America's "atomic spending" alone exceeded the appropriations for public health by 320 per cent, education by 620 per cent and state housing 44.5-fold.

Estimates show that even a 50 per cent reduction in taxes would substantially increase the income and purchasing power of the population (by a minimum of \$30,000 million in the U.S.A.). This reduction notwithstanding, adequate resources will remain for the needs of public education, building, the health services and social insurance.

Furthermore, disarmament and the termination of military expenditures will not only lift the excessive tax burden. It will also balance the budgets and improve the circulation of currency. Immense sums now swallowed up by state debts will be released. Inflation will recede, and the real incomes of the average family will rise. The average rate of profit derived by enterprises engaged in civilian production will not drop. On the contrary, the tax reduction will increase effective demand, and the market for civilian commodities will expand.

It should be borne in mind, however, that in the West it is impossible to abolish taxes on the population entirely, since they constitute the economic foundation of the capitalist state. Yet the immediate gain for the population of the capitalist countries (higher average family budgets and general improvement in the living standard) resulting from a termination of the cold war and the arms race would still be immense. And if we look, say, ten years ahead, that gain assumes truly fantastic proportions—\$1,500,000 mil-

lion. Sensible use of this astronomic sum could literally transform our planet.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that, speaking of the finances and the living standard of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. and the other socialist countries, disarmament will also undoubtedly be an additional factor of economic progress.

The struggle of people of diverse races, nationalities, political views and religious convictions for general and complete disarmament is the surest and most reliable way to durable peace and to the elimination of economic burdens and privations connected with wars and war preparation.

**APN Correspondent: Some believe that general and complete disarmament will undermine the Western economy. Do you think they are right?**

**L. Gromov**, Senior Researcher, Institute of World Economy and International Relations, Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.:

It is quite true that such apprehensions are often voiced in the West. But what lies at their root?

Disarmament will release for civilian employment millions of people now serving in the armed forces and war industries. More production plant, large quantities of laboratory and testing equipment, immense supplies of raw materials, instruments of labour and finished goods will be put to civilian use. Last but not least, considerable funds from the state treasury and private enterprises will be converted to civilian needs.

Consequently, disarmament will eliminate the source of income of millions of factory and office workers and thousands of employers engaged in war production. All these people will have to find new sources of income in the civilian economy. Countries that undertake general and complete disarmament will therefore have to reorganise their economies to a certain extent.

For the West, such a reorganisation is naturally bound up with a number of specific economic and social problems.

Two distinct positions are clearly reflected in the Western views on the economic aspects of disarmament.

The first lays emphasis on the difficulty of the economic problems of disarmament, accentuating the big losses to be incurred by people now employed in the war machine, while it completely ignores the possibility of their quick and effective employment in the peace economy. The exponents of this view predict that disarmament will undermine the Western economy and lead to chaos and crisis.

This is, on the one hand, the view of people not conversant in economics, its structure, laws of development and interrelations; on the other, such views clearly show how greatly disarmament is feared by the groups, organisations and individuals whose special privileges and incomes are bound up with the war preparations.

Apprehensive of disarmament, these groups pass off their own selfish interests for those of the nation, and their personal losses (which they fear a stop in the arms drive will cause) for economic disaster.

But there are also many conscientious and objective economists in the West probing the concrete tasks which disarmament will pose to the Western economy, assessing the scale and character of these tasks, and devising ways and means for their effective and painless solution, beneficial to the economy and the people. This second attitude is adopted by most Western scientists, journalists and public leaders. These people belong to different social sections and parties, and differ in their political convictions. But they see eye to eye on the effects of disarmament.

From the economic point of view, all of them believe disarmament is not only feasible, but would be a boon to the peoples of the West.

The economic problems posed by disarmament, they go on to say, can and must be solved in a comparatively short time to the benefit of the overwhelming majority of the population.

Last but not least, solution of the economic problems of disarmament with the maximum benefit for the economy

and population of the Western countries calls for a series of measures on a national and local scale, worked out and prepared beforehand, and for special efforts on the part of the government.

Those spokesmen of the business community who realise the need for a special and organised solution of the economic problems of disarmament, agree that it is, on the whole, a boon to the Western economy. They believe that *disarmament itself creates the conditions necessary and sufficient for a solution of the economic problems that it poses.*

Indeed, besides releasing manpower and production capacities from military employment, disarmament will also release immense financial resources. Some of the Western estimates show that if the means now spent on military needs are switched to civilian needs, the volume of manufactured commodities and services in the disarming states will not decrease; on the contrary, it will put the vast amount of labour and material now squandered for military purposes to good use.

In our opinion, the civilian utilisation of the resources to be released in the Western countries through disarmament may effectively follow three distinct trends.

1. Growth of personal consumption through tax reductions; as a result, much of the raw materials now used in the armaments plants may be used in the production of consumer goods.

2. Growth of social consumption and satisfaction of national requirements in community services, transport, education and public health, social insurance, land amelioration, air and water cleaning, and, finally, in joint international scientific and technical efforts.

There is, for example, a number of ambitious engineering projects, whose realisation would radically improve the Earth's climate. Among these is a plan to assault the cold (erecting a dam across Bering Strait at a cost of \$20,000 million, utilisation of the energy of the tides, and altering the direction of the Gulf Stream), an offensive against the deserts (adjusting the level of the Caspian Sea, reconstruct-

ing the Black Sea, irrigating the Gobi Desert by Tibet rivers, irrigating Africa by the Congo River and sea-water on the "boiling pan" principle, and transporting Arctic icebergs to the arid areas), etc.

This would also solve the vital power problem and the problem of fertilisers, and many international transport problems (such as automatically controlled automobile and air transport, and high-speed water transport). This switch-over of war efforts to the sphere of civilian endeavour can and must consume a substantial part of the finances and manpower, notably the research personnel and production plant now used in the arms drive, and provide enough work for the rocket-engineering, atomic and radio-electronic industries.

3. Greater exports of consumer and industrial goods, primarily by way of free assistance to the economically underdeveloped countries. Commodity exports may also be increased by lifting restrictions on trade with the socialist countries, and by granting them long-term and mutually advantageous credits. Lastly, disarmament will stimulate a general expansion of world trade through a more rational international division of labour and the most effective use of the economic, geographical and national features of the various countries.

Expansion of international commerce and assistance may be furthered by both government and private means and resources, now applied in the preparation of war.

The important thing is that these trends hold out splendid economic prospects. Large-scale social construction, and scientific, technical and cultural development are likely to create an additional and lasting demand for diverse types of goods and services. The same may be said about the expansion of commerce on credit, particularly the export of industrial equipment, which is a form of trade that engenders new trade. Estimates by Soviet and Western economists show that the switch-over of military resources to civilian needs will create an extensive civilian market which

will not only fully replace the present war market, but will greatly exceed it.

In the event of disarmament, some portion of the funds out of the Western Powers' military budgets will, naturally, go to cover the expense of converting the economy to civilian production—training of servicemen in civilian trades; providing employment for industrial and office workers of the few military enterprises and institutions which, owing to specialisation or economically unfavourable location, cannot be converted to civilian production; rendering assistance to industrialists switching from military to civilian orders, etc. But in that case, too, the market is not lost; it retains its former capacity, though it assumes new, changing forms.

Thus, on the whole, it may be safely said that disarmament as such, far from undermining the Western economy, will, on the contrary, ease its present difficulties, connected largely with the armaments race.

The same conclusion is drawn by a commission of U.N. experts who submitted a report on the economic and social consequences of disarmament to the 18-Nation Committee. The report points out, among other things, that the diversion to peaceful purposes of the resources now in military use could be accomplished to the benefit of all countries and lead to the improvement of world economic and social conditions.

**APN Correspondent: What benefits will general and complete disarmament yield to the economically underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America?**

**A. Kodachenko**, Senior Researcher, Institute of World Economy and International Relations, Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.:

General and complete disarmament and the establishment of durable peace will promote a solution of the vitally important problems facing the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The economically underdeveloped countries are making strenuous efforts to end their centuries-old backwardness.



The actual extent of this backwardness is revealed by the fact that the average annual per capita income in the Western capitalist countries is \$1,400, or 11,6 times higher than in underdeveloped countries, where it is no more than \$120. Compared with the annual per capita income in the United States (\$2,700), the difference is still more striking, being 2,150 per cent.

What these countries obviously need most to solve their formidable economic problems is peace. This is why the struggle for general and complete disarmament is a most urgent practical task for the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

The fears that disarmament will weaken their position vis-à-vis the aggressive designs of the imperialists are absolutely groundless.

In the first place, the Soviet Union's plan for general and complete disarmament under strict international control is universal in character and applies in equal measure to all countries. Furthermore, the plan proposed by the U.S.S.R. provides that general and complete disarmament begin with the elimination of the means of nuclear weapons delivery, the withdrawal of troops from foreign territories and the closure of foreign military bases. This will in no way affect the defences of the economically underdeveloped countries, since the latter do not possess nuclear weapons, means of their delivery and military bases abroad. At the same time, already in the first stage of disarmament, the danger of these countries becoming involved in a nuclear war will greatly diminish, owing to the elimination of the means of delivery of nuclear weapons and the termination of their production in all countries, and to the closure of foreign military bases in their own territories.

General and complete disarmament, as proposed by the U.S.S.R., would render unnecessary the existence of huge and costly armies in the underdeveloped countries, and would enable them to withdraw from military blocs and alliances of the SEATO and CENTO type, imposed on them by the Western Powers. Abolition of war blocs used by the

imperialists to combat the national-liberation movement, coupled with the closure of foreign military bases, would guarantee genuine respect for the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of the African, Asian and Latin American countries. It is common knowledge, after all, that special units stationed at, say, the U.S. military bases in the Philippines and Okinawa are kept in combat readiness to suppress the national-liberation movement in South Viet-Nam, Laos and other Asian countries. Removal of the threat of force would end enmity and distrust among nations.

Disarmament will help the peoples to remove all forms of imperialist domination and achieve final victory in their national-liberation movement.

Of the greatest importance to African, Asian and Latin American countries is the economic aspect of general and complete disarmament. Despite winning political independence, most of these countries remain the object of imperialist economic exploitation. Nearly \$20,000 million in profits are being pumped out of these countries by foreign monopolies every year. One of the chief tasks facing the peoples of these countries today is to alter radically the pattern of international economic relations imposed on them by the imperialists, based as it is on plunder and exploitation, and to replace it with a new type of relations founded on genuine equality and mutual advantage.

Relief from military spending will have a most beneficial effect on the economies of the African, Asian and Latin American countries. Military expenditure is an unbearable burden to them, and especially the countries involved in the various Western military and political blocs. Membership in these blocs imposes burdensome obligations on them, connected with the maintenance of huge armies, inconsistent with their national interests. More than two-thirds of all budget allocations of the countries involved in the Asian military blocs are spent directly or indirectly on the maintenance of armies. Western propaganda goes to great pains to prove that by rendering military aid to a country, the U.S.A. foots a big portion of the military bill.

How remote this is from the truth may be seen from the following data, cited in U.S. Congress. In the 1957/58 fiscal year the military expenditure of Turkey, Greece, Iran, Iraq, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia totalled \$1,018 million, whereas direct U.S. military assistance to these countries amounted to a mere \$332 million. The proportion changed very little in the years that followed.

The aggregate strength of the armies in the economically underdeveloped countries exceeds 5,000,000, excluding the police. The annual military expenditures of these countries add up to approximately \$6,000-7,000 million. This imposing figure is \$3,000 million higher than the additional foreign aid required, according to U.N. estimates, to ensure steady economic progress in the African, Asian and Latin American countries.

But this list does not exhaust the economic benefits these countries stand to gain through general disarmament. Providing as it does for an extensive development of international economic co-operation based on equality and mutual advantage, disarmament would greatly improve their position in the world market. The expansion of world trade resulting from disarmament would, in particular, stabilise and subsequently extend the raw-materials and food markets, which are vitally important to the economy of most of the African, Asian and Latin American countries.

Suffice it to say that at present raw materials and food-stuffs account for about four-fifths of the total African, Middle East and Latin American exports and for two-thirds of the Asian exports (excluding the Soviet Central Asian Republics and the socialist states). The foreign exchange these countries obtain for their exports determines the size of their purchases in the world market of capital equipment and materials for the fulfilment of their economic development programmes. Fluctuations in demand and prices on the key exports retard their economic progress and nullify the benefits of foreign economic aid. U.N. experts estimate that a mere 5 per cent price drop on commodities exported by the underdeveloped countries represents a sum almost

equal to the total private and government grants and "gifts" they receive annually from foreign countries. It is therefore obvious that the problem of stabilising raw-materials and food markets and the establishment of a fair relation between export and import prices is no less important to these countries than the broadest of foreign aid programmes.

Disarmament would double world trade at the very least. It would doubtlessly help to stabilise prices and also almost double the capacity of the raw-materials and food markets. Greater export revenue in the underdeveloped countries would accelerate their economic progress quite substantially.

In putting forward its plan for general and complete disarmament, the Soviet Union also invited the West to compete in economic assistance to the underdeveloped countries. The aggregate military expenditure of all the states is \$120,000 million, which is roughly equal to the national incomes of the backward countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. If they could get at least 20 per cent of the money spent by the developed countries for military purposes, the problem of obtaining funds from foreign sources to finance their economic development would be solved.

An atmosphere of international confidence and co-operation would enable many Asian, African and Latin American countries to draw more extensively on the achievements of world science, technology and culture.

Finally, the joint efforts of the peoples freed from colonial rule and of the socialist countries against the war danger will, as the Twenty-Second Congress of the C.P.S.U. has noted, become a cardinal factor of universal peace. This powerful front, representing the will and might of two-thirds of mankind, will be able to curb the aggressors.

It is therefore perfectly clear that disarmament would greatly accelerate the economic development of the African, Asian and Latin American countries, and would enable them to do away with backwardness and catch up the industrially developed nations in double quick time.

**APN Correspondent:** Is it true that cessation of war production is likely to add to the unemployment?

**L. Gromov:**

General and complete disarmament implies abolition of the entire war machine now serviced, according to what seems to me a very modest estimate of the U.N. experts, by at least 30 million people. Military pursuits of all sorts have diverted at least 50 million people from civilian jobs, though we believe the figure of 100 million to be much closer to the truth.

Release of this vast mass (chiefly men) through disarmament naturally poses the very serious problem of employing them in diverse spheres of peaceful activity, primarily in the civil branches of the economy.

As regards the socialist countries, such an absorption of manpower does not raise any serious problems, for there are no private industrialists there standing between production and consumption, and clamouring for profits. Hence, there is no contradiction between the output and sale of commodities and services. Unemployment coupled with under-capacity operation of industrial plant is therefore totally ruled out. This is why the sphere of peaceful labour in the socialist countries can easily absorb any production capacities and utilise them most effectively to accelerate the economic and cultural development of the peoples and to improve their well-being. Moreover, the system of economic planning in the socialist states, which promotes the supreme interests of the people, ensures the peaceful utilisation of manpower and material resources released through disarmament in the shortest possible time and to the best advantage of the population.

The unilateral reduction of the armed forces in the U.S.S.R. is a signal example of this. It was well prepared and organised, servicemen switched over to peaceful pursuits according to a thoroughly prepared plan, measures were carried through to ensure the material security of the discharged men, they were duly trained for civilian jobs, and given employment.

Not so in the West, where private enterprise, moved by the sole aim of extracting maximum profits for the capitalist, leads to disparity between production and effective demand, to the permanent existence of idle production plant and unemployed manpower. In recent years technological progress through automation has cut the demand for manpower and material resources. Unemployment has grown to an unprecedented scale and towers for many countries as a national problem of prime significance.

It is only natural that in these circumstances the prospect that millions of people will be released who are now serving in the armed forces, employed in the war industries, working on military projects, and designing and improving modern weapons at research centres, evokes grave alarm in the masses. The forces who seek to perpetuate the arms race exploit this anxiety of the working people, unfamiliar with the complex mechanics of economy and employment. They further their selfish aims by playing on the worker's natural fears for his immediate future, and thereby try to divert the masses from the struggle for disarmament.

It should not be said, to be sure, that disarmament will wipe out unemployment. Unemployment will not be wiped out until the organic defects of the capitalist economy are eliminated. However, disarmament, which will give mankind, including the peoples of the West, many benefits, of which the most precious is peace, will in no way aggravate the present unemployment.

Numerous serious investigations by Western economists show that it is quite possible to disarm without adding to the unemployment. What is more, they reveal that disarmament is likely to reduce the present unemployment or, at any rate, retard its growth.

How will economic demilitarisation in the West provide employment for the people released from war production?

To begin with, let us briefly examine the research by the prominent American economist, Wassily Leontief, which is devoted to the economic aspects of disarmament. Leontief determined the employment figure for the diverse sectors

of the U.S. economy by means of balance computations and "expenditure-output" matrix tables, and established that every thousand million dollars spent on arms provide employment, including the armed forces and administrative personnel, to 145,000 Americans, while the same outlay in the consumer industries and the export industries filling orders for the underdeveloped countries provides jobs to 107,000, and civic government projects to 207,000 people.

Hence, if the U.S. military outlay is equally distributed in these civilian industries, the resultant demand in manpower (more than 140,000 people for every expended thousand million dollars) will fully cover the present employment in the military sphere. Moreover, Leontief estimates that nearly half the people released through disarmament will, in the case of the U.S.A., be servicemen demobilised from the armed forces, who will come to the labour market gradually, over a period of several years.

Thus, even Leontief's estimates, which are the least optimistic of all the serious investigations made in the U.S.A. of the economic aspects of disarmament, show quite conclusively that disarmament will not cause any additional unemployment.

The estimates of another prominent American economist, Victor Perlo, lead up to still more favourable conclusions. Perlo indicates that the allocation for peaceful purposes of just \$42,000 million (1958 data) now spent on the arms drive, coupled with universal introduction of the 35-hour week, would increase employment in the civilian industries by 12 to 15 million. This will provide jobs not only for the demobilised servicemen and the personnel of all the war industries, but also absorb all the registered unemployed and provide millions of vacancies for the younger generation applying for jobs for the first time. The increase in employment in state housing construction is estimated at 1.3 million, in the public services at 500,000 and in civilian research at another 500,000. Extension of the public health services, a greater guaranteed wage minimum and improved social insurance will provide additional jobs to some

5 million people in the sphere of civilian production, and the proposed reduction of the working week to 35 hours will absorb another 4 million people. Lastly, the development of international trade and increased assistance to underdeveloped countries will provide jobs for 1 million people.

It is therefore quite safe to say that all people released from the military sphere will find employment, and that unemployment, far from growing, is going to shrink to some extent. This will, however, call for certain organisational measures in the economic sphere.

There undoubtedly exist trends in the use of resources released through disarmament which, though they may yield temporary advantages to some sections and groups in the West, will not produce the desired growth of peaceful employment and will not satisfy the most urgent needs of the peoples. This will be the case, for example, if tax reductions are applied primarily and chiefly to the high-income brackets. It is likely at once to produce an increase of surplus capital (a fact, by the way, which is already quite widespread). Similar consequences may arise if available national resources are spent not for large-scale public works, but to pay the state debt, particularly the debt incurred by different states, counties, etc.

It follows that disarmament may be effected without an additional growth of unemployment in the Western countries, provided the governments work out an economic disarmament programme consistent with the national interests.

**APN Correspondent: What impact would general and complete disarmament have on the development of international economic relations?**

**Y. Kapelinsky**, department head, World Market Research Institute, Ministry of Foreign Trade of the U.S.S.R.:

General and complete disarmament would deliver mankind from the terrible threat of a destructive thermonuclear war and create favourable conditions for the peace-



ful coexistence and peaceful economic competition of states with different social systems.

The disbandment of armies will be attended by a considerable reduction of taxes, and will thereby increase the purchasing power of the population. The greater effective demand will, in turn, inevitably stimulate national production and imports of commodities not produced domestically or produced in insufficient quantities. It should be borne in mind that the termination of the cold war and the re-establishment of confidence in international relations will make restrictions and trade discrimination absolutely senseless, enabling all countries to make the most of the advantages of a rational international division of labour.

Disarmament will open up limitless prospects for world trade. Take East-West trade, for example. The socialist countries account for over one-third of the world population and for more than one-third of the world industrial output. Is it not obvious that, given normal trade relations, they could be a vast, continually developing market for Western exports and an important and reliable source of industrial raw materials, foods, machinery, equipment and other industrial items. That this is so, is confirmed by the extension of trade between the socialist and capitalist countries from \$3,000 million in 1952 to \$7,500 million in 1959, notwithstanding the Western policy of discriminations and restrictions.

Further, if we assume that only half of the total military expenditure, now amounting to \$120,000 million a year, is spent on raising the purchasing power of the population and that only 25 per cent of the rising demand is met by imports, the aggregate world imports will even so rise by \$15,000 million, or 25 per cent above the present level.

General and complete disarmament will pave the way to much broader economic co-operation between the industrially developed nations and the less developed countries. It may be recalled that national economic growth in the latter is limited by a lack of funds to pay for the imports of the desired equipment and raw materials and for the

cost of building projects. The less developed countries could obtain part of the funds for domestic investment by abolishing military expenditures, which today aggregate \$6,000-7,000 million, or one-third of their total budget revenue. Allocation of the means released through disarmament for economic development would also considerably increase their export resources and, consequently, provide better opportunities for the import of goods from the industrial countries.

At the same time, the stop to military spending in the industrially developed nations would enable them to spend a part of the released resources on helping the less developed countries. If, say, one-tenth of the present military expenditure of the industrial countries were allocated for this purpose, the total assistance would increase, according to some estimates, by more than \$12,000 million a year. Inasmuch as this assistance would be rendered chiefly in equipment, raw materials and consumer goods, the imports of the less developed countries would increase by the above-mentioned figure, or would exceed the present level by approximately one-third. Exports from the industrially developed countries would increase in the same proportion.

General and complete disarmament and the use of the latest scientific and technological achievements for peaceful purposes will open up splendid prospects for economic co-operation. The building of atomic power stations, for example, would accelerate the economic development of areas rich in mineral deposits but lacking adequate power resources. At present effective use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes is greatly restricted by the nuclear arms race, wherein the efforts of scientists and engineers are concentrated on the development of new types of lethal weapons. Prohibition of atomic and thermonuclear weapons would promote genuine international co-operation in the field of nuclear energy. Far-flung use of peaceful atomic energy would step up trade in equipment, instruments and materials required for the construction and exploitation of atomic power stations.

A considerable influence on the development of scientific and economic contacts between states would likewise be exerted by a joint programme for the use of outer space for peaceful purposes. At present the problem of combining the efforts of individual countries in space research is running into serious difficulties stemming from the natural desire of every country to conceal its achievement in rocketry, applicable both for peaceful and military purposes.

Termination of research in the military field and an extensive exchange of scientific and technical information would accelerate technical progress in the peaceful sphere, lead to the appearance of new types of goods and bring down the cost of production, which, in turn, would contribute to broader international trade.

Good prospects for the development of international economic ties would open up through co-operation in projects of interest to a few states at once, including, for instance, the establishment of a single all-European power system, joint construction of oil and gas pipelines, comprehensive use of rivers, etc. The realisation of such projects would require a broad exchange of machinery, equipment and materials, and would also act beneficially on the development of world trade.

Finally, general and complete disarmament would help to establish genuine international confidence and co-operation and make the present restrictions in East-West trade quite senseless. This would provide important conditions for the further development and extension of the international division of labour. In particular, much greater use would be made of the immense opportunities latent in the development of economic ties between the capitalist and socialist countries.

Cessation of the arms race and the application of military funds to the development of the peace economy would accelerate the development of the productive forces and scientific and technological progress. All this would provide an excellent basis for greater international trade and higher living standards for all nations.

**APN Correspondent: What, in your opinion, is the connection between science and technology, on the one hand, and the arms drive, on the other? What consequences may be expected to arise from general and complete disarmament in this respect?**

**Y. Sheinin**, Research Worker, Institute of World Economy and International Relations, Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.:

In our time science is being increasingly transformed into a direct productive force of society. This process has assumed the character of a technical and scientific revolution. Deplorably, under the impact of the arms drive the technical and scientific revolution has in a number of cases been proceeding most rapidly in the military sphere. This goes against the objective purpose of technical and scientific progress, which is to improve steadily the living conditions of all mankind, rather than contribute to its destruction.

The historical responsibility for the misuse of modern scientific achievements by turning them into instruments of mass annihilation rests with the capitalist system, which hastened to direct the technical and scientific revolution along military lines and subordinate it to the aggressive aims of its militarist policy. Wherever militarism reigns supreme, priority is given to scientific and technological development for military purposes, which seriously hampers any broad use of scientific discoveries in the interests of peace.

The increasingly active role of the bourgeois state in subordinating science and technology to military aims is manifested in its financial policy. An analysis of statistical data reveals that the growth of U.S. expenditure on scientific research in the military field over the past two decades has been many times greater than the growth in the total expenditure on scientific development, with the result that the share of military research in the gross national product has, according to official data, increased 30 times over in 20 years, whereas in the total military expenditure it has increased more than 50-fold, exceeding one-third of the

total U.S. spending on research and development (considering all sources of financing).

The Federal Government finances about 40 per cent of all research and designing carried out by industrial companies, and almost exclusively for military purposes. Private industrial firms, and particularly the major corporations, cling jealously to their leading role in the practical realisation of the military research programmes. They spend more than 70 per cent of all their allocations for these purposes and more than 80 per cent of the means appropriated from the Federal research and development budget.

This "war business" yields giant profits. The 15 major suppliers of the U.S. armed forces handled more than 40 per cent of the government military orders and paid less than 4 per cent of the total corporation taxes, and increased their profits between 1952 and 1957 by 48 per cent, as against the average U.S. corporation profit of 18 per cent. Small wonder that the heightened interest of U.S. industrial firms in research is most directly linked with war business, which thrives on the arms drive.

The arms drive in the U.S.A. has engendered a *veritable "industry of discoveries"*, both in the broad sense (profit-yielding scientific research generally) and in the narrow sense (specialised commercial laboratories and engineering firms). The scale of this "industry of discoveries" in the broad sense may be illustrated by existing estimates, showing that research and designing, if singled out as a separate branch, would rank sixth in U.S. industry for its sales.

This newest and most promising branch of the U.S. economy is more military in character than any of the others. This is illustrated by the strong growth of the branches constituting the material basis of the technical and scientific revolution in America's military effort. Backed by government contracts, the biggest U.S. monopolies had a hand in developing the atomic bomb. The history of America's nuclear industry is a history of struggle between giant mo-

nopoly alliances for control of the "industry of discoveries".

Government financing imparts a military trend to most of the research done by the U.S. universities and colleges. In 1959 the leading universities and technological institutes controlled 28 Federal research centres and laboratories working on military contracts worth \$200 million.

Militarism hampers the development of fundamental theoretical research. Branches of theoretical science that need government assistance most because of the high cost of research, are the most dependent on the various military administrations, which have immense financial and material resources. A prominent part in the development of theoretical science is played by the Office of Naval Research (ONR). Yet a study of ONR activities in 1958-59 showed that even this "model" military research body was spending no more than half of what was actually necessary on theoretical research. The facts reveal that, no matter how great the support of the military establishment, theoretical science, the core of technical and scientific progress, is invariably hamstrung by military pragmatism which, by its very nature, is incompatible with genuine scientific progress.

Estimates by McGraw-Hill economists for 1945-59 reveal a steady decline in the share of allocations for fundamental projects in the total U.S. research and development expenditure, and particularly in the universities, colleges and institutes—that traditional citadel of American theoretical science. This tendency conflicts with the exactions of the current scientific and technical revolution for the *priority* development of theoretical research, which sets the stage for all other technical and scientific progress. The industrialists' growing disappointment in theoretical science, coupled with the fact that it is gradually being obscured by applied research, chiefly of a military nature, in the universities, is getting to be a damper on the prospects of scientific and technical progress in the leading country of modern capitalism.

I cite examples from the U.S. scene, because it is the most typical. But, with a reservation here and there, it exists in other capitalist countries as well.

Everywhere, this one-sided approach to scientific and technical progress, an approach engendered by the arms race, goes against the objective requirements of scientific development. General and complete disarmament is the only way of ensuring the progressive and harmonious development of science and technology.

This disarmament under effective control will relieve scientists of working for war. That is the only way to achieve a really peaceful reconversion of military research that will end the militarisation of modern science.

The same idea was expressed by scientists at the Seventh Pugwash Conference concerning the problems of science and international relations. "Science," the Conference resolution says, "misused by nations to foster their competitive interests as world powers made possible the destruction of mankind. Science used cooperatively by all nations for the increase of human knowledge and the improvement of men's productive capacity can give all men on earth a satisfactory and worthwhile life.

"The responsibility of scientists is not only to help in preventing the destructive use of science but also to foster its constructive use."

Disarmament is the most effective means of achieving the genuinely broad international co-operation required for the solution of the following major scientific problems:

1. Investigation and use of the incalculable resources of the World Ocean, its bed, waters, fauna and flora.
2. Study and use of the Earth's crust and mantle by the method of deep drilling.
3. Complex meteorological forecasts.
4. Use and conservancy of natural resources, and prevention of the consequences of natural calamities.
5. Outer space research (the physics and the biological effects of the cosmic medium, exchange of information and methods, regulation of the use of radio frequencies, exten-

sion of space tracking systems, development of an agreed programme of space launchings in the Quiet Sun Year and an international system of communication and meteorological satellites, co-operation in the exploration of the Moon, etc.).

6. In biology—multiplication of food resources by disseminating the most progressive farm techniques, etc., international co-operation in public health and medicine (especially cancer research, cardiovascular and contagious diseases, immunology, mental disorders, sanitation, problems of old age, nourishment, genetics, etc.). Solution of the problem of water and air pollution by industrial and radioactive waste and fallout, and conservation of the Earth's flora and fauna.

7. In the physical sciences—broader co-operation in controlled thermonuclear reactions, the physics of plasma and transuranium elements, establishment of an international high-energy physics laboratory and joint designing and construction of an accelerator of 300,000 million electron-volts, establishment of an international computing centre with a giant computing device and considerable improvement in the coordination of international scientific research. Organisation of international research laboratories in concert with the international "Integrated Science" computing centre would involve a capital expenditure of about \$5,000 million.

Realisation of these immense projects will represent only the first step. General and complete disarmament will place in mankind's service the incalculable resources discovered by modern science and technology. A world without arms and wars will become a world of unprecedented scientific and cultural progress.

**APN Correspondent: What can you say about the claims of certain Western scientists that the arms drive derives from the very nature of man and his struggle for survival?**

**V. Gantman, Senior Researcher, Institute of World Economy and International Relations, Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.:**



Some Western social scientists contend that the arms drive and the urge for war are not an upshot of the social system. War and the militarist actions preceding it are depicted as a product of the "original sin" and mankind's sinful and fatal heredity stemming from Adam, which determines its greed, envy, pugnacity, avarice and other negative aspects of "eternal" human nature. This "theory" is not novel. It was propagated before, and especially after Sigmund Freud. Its exponents took up Freud's conclusion that humankind in its present shape springs from "an endless ancestry of murderers with whom the lust for killing was in the blood, as possibly it is to this day with ourselves".

Small wonder that the followers of Freud and his method in the sphere of international relations have now produced a "profound" inquiry titled, "World Tension. The Psychopathology of International Relations". In this book, published in New York several years ago, Mr. Jones, President of the International Psychoanalytical Association, obviously tries to project the practices of a psychiatric clinic to the sphere of international relations. Mr. Jones says that in probing the causes of wars "we have to do with not merely any such recent matters as the mischief of armament makers, the iniquities of secret diplomacy, or the evils inherent in the capitalistic system, but with a far older, deeper and more general tendency of human groups to generate hostility among themselves". The root of the evil, it appears, lies in the fact that "there is in man a permanent capacity for hostility, aggression and cruelty towards his fellow creatures". Thus, in Mr. Jones's presentation, the pathology of reason has a socio-political character and schizophrenia is a natural state of international relations.

Of course, Freudianism is an excellent way of reducing all world phenomena to the narrow problem of personal relations between Adam and Eve and the two sexes which they originated. With some imagination, this method could probably also be applied to explain the Earth's gravitation.

Yet most of the Western experts in international relations evidently feel that the "psychopathological" method of analysing world politics is not serious enough. Accordingly, they advance arguments which, in their opinion, carry more weight, since they are closer to the economic sphere.

They maintain that the resources of the different countries, and particularly food supplies, lag behind the population growth and cannot satisfy the requirements of all; this compels people—this time more consciously than in the clinical cases described by Jones—to start wars and conquests. Here Freud's shadow recedes into the background, giving place to Malthus's ghost, for it was Malthus who forecast mutual destruction of mankind for fear of overpopulation. The Malthusians of today are trying to adapt the theory of their prophet to the international relations of the nuclear age.

In their recently published book called *A Forward Strategy for America*, Robert Strausz-Hupé, William R. Kintner and Stefan T. Possony, three American specialists in international relations, regard the high density of the population in certain countries as one of the chief causes leading to another world war.

The conclusions to be drawn from this theory are simple enough. If overpopulation leads to war, atomic war will end overpopulation, opening up the prospect of "universal peace". So eminent an expert in atomic weapons as the U.S. physicist Leo Szilard believes that the present nuclear potential is equivalent to 60,000-70,000 million tons of TNT. Scientists estimate that this is more than enough not only to annihilate the population of the globe, but also to plough up the land surface of our planet. Such is the prospect held out to mankind by people who assure us that overpopulation is responsible for all our woes and that the best and most effective way of combating it is a world thermonuclear war.

If world resources are short and people have to fight for survival, if the population in certain countries ("Asian", of

course) is rapidly increasing, they say, the world is inevitably doomed to war against those who "reach out their hand" to the granaries and storehouses of the West. And when that happens, the West will have no choice but to deliver a nuclear blow against the "aggressors", thereby safeguarding its stores and, at the same time, "saving" the East from overpopulation by reducing millions of people to atomic dust.

It is not likely, however, that these arguments are taken seriously even by the people who make them. Our planet is rich enough to provide all its inhabitants with everything they need, provided there is durable world peace, universal justice and equality. How vastly the triumph of disarmament will contribute to the growth of wealth on the Earth is shown quite conclusively by my colleagues in this booklet. There is no other trait more typical of human nature than the urge for peace and creative labour. And, conversely, nothing is more dangerous to human life, to man's mental balance, to his material and cultural interests, than war, particularly in this nuclear age. And no pathological proclivities of any individual can in principle lead to war, unless it is generated by socio-economic causes.

It may be argued that the pathology of Hitler had played a definite part in the unleashing of the Second World War. But the Krupps, Thyssens and the many other monopolists who wanted to make war a source of profit and a means of achieving world domination hardly suffered from any mental disease. Yet it was their designs that served as *the actual underlying cause of this war*, in which Hitler was no more than a political tool of the "death merchants".

It may be argued, also, that in our complex age any madman in a responsible capacity associated with nuclear weapons can start a world war. The *American Nation*, for example, wrote that many people are "evil by nature" and are liable to pull the trigger of universal destruction out of sheer malice. There is, deplorably, ample evidence that in the capitalist environment such a highly dangerous situa-

tion is really possible, but possible only on account of the arms drive, which builds up an atmosphere of fear and war hysteria.

It is perfectly obvious that the Freudian psychopathological theory of the "wickedness" and "aggressiveness" of human nature, and the Malthusian mouthings about the "baneful effects of overpopulation" serve a *definite policy*.

If man is sinful by nature, nothing can be done about it. There have always been wars, and man is powerless to avert them now, or in the future. Such fatalism hamstringing the people's will and determination to bar the road to the arms drive and war.

No, the root of the evil does not lie in the nature of man, in overpopulation or the high rate of population growth. *It lies in deep-going economic and social causes, in the nature of the social and political system.*

Last year the *Nation* published Fred J. Cook's work, "Juggernaut: The Warfare State". As far as I know, Mr. Cook is a bourgeois journalist far removed from communism and Marxism; nor is the *Nation* a Communist publication. Yet Mr. Cook gave a truthful account of the forces that are stubbornly dragging the West into the quagmire of the arms drive, war psychosis and destructive war. These forces are personified by "the military-industrial complex" and, above all, by a group of monopolies that have made war production their business, and war preparations its natural element. America's "military-industrial complex", says Mr. Cook, is, essentially, a symbiosis of big capital and bellicose generals, who are dragging the American state and society, along with all mankind, towards the abyss of atomic war.

As for the socialist countries, they have no war monopolies and groups battenning on war. Under socialism there can be no classes interested in war or in dominating other peoples. This is the mainspring of its foreign policy of peace, of its desire and readiness to solve the disarmament problem at once.

**APN Correspondent:** What are the chief obstacles to a solution of the disarmament problem? Can they be removed?

M. Voslensky, Senior Researcher, Institute of World Economy and International Relations, Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.:

Official Western propaganda contends that the chief obstacle lies in the Soviet Union's refusal to institute control. But this contention is groundless.

On April 20, 1962, Soviet Prime Minister N. S. Khrushchov once again explained the Soviet position. "We consider," he said, "that if agreement on disarmament is reached, all countries will have to be subjected to the strictest inspection and control. . . . We must have a system where each country would be confident that the other countries comply scrupulously with their undertakings, and that they really have destroyed, or are destroying, the weapons subject to destruction.

"That is why we must have our inspectors in the territory of the U.S.A. and other countries, while the United States and other countries should have their inspectors in our territory and in the territory of other countries party to the agreement on general and complete disarmament."

The Soviet Union has submitted to the Geneva Conference a Draft Treaty of General and Complete Disarmament under Strict International Control. It provides for the establishment of an International Organisation to supervise and control the entire process of general and complete disarmament. Please note that I said, "the process of *disarmament*"! The Soviet Union is ready to accept most thorough control over disarmament, but it objects to control without disarmament or, in other words, control over existing armaments, which, in any language, means intelligence and military espionage.

The argument between the Western Powers and the socialist countries on the question of control derives from the attitude of the United States and its allies, who insist,

under various pretexts, on military spying instead of control over disarmament, and thereby obstruct agreement.

But this obstacle is an effect rather than a cause. The actual reason why the disarmament problem has not yet been settled is that the ruling quarters of the biggest capitalist countries do not want disarmament. They do not want it, because the manufacture and sales of arms is an extremely profitable enterprise, and we know that the munitions concerns are closely linked with the ruling quarters of the NATO powers. The other reason why they do not want disarmament is that they continue to rely on strength in politics.

Let me cite a few facts. The U.S. concerns manufacturing atomic weapons receive a 100 per cent profit on the invested capital. Fabulous profits are raked in also by the missile manufacturers. In 1961, Lockheed Aircraft, for example, made a profit of more than \$26 million. Boeing, the aircraft and missile builders, increased their turnover by \$250 million in 1961, while the turnover of North American Aviation, which supplies engines for the Atlas, Thor, Redstone and Jupiter missiles, went up by \$310 million.

It is only natural, therefore, that the heads of these concerns regard the prospect of disarmament as a major disaster, that they go out of their way to prevent disarmament, to reject it under any pretext, and to bury disarmament in endless diplomatic arguings.

The connections of the concerns with the political leaders and leading political groups of the West are an open secret.

There is yet another question which is, in substance, closely connected today with the problem of disarmament. This is the question of a German peace treaty and the normalisation of the situation in West Berlin. A solution of the German problem would contribute greatly to the relaxation of international tension and the creation of greater confidence among states and, consequently, of an atmosphere favourable for a disarmament agreement.

But influential Western quarters fall in with the Bonn revenge-seekers, who scorn disarmament and yearn for speedier arming and for nuclear missiles for the Bundeswehr. The Western rulers still reject the reasonable and realistic proposals to abolish the occupation regime in West Berlin and to convert it into a free demilitarised city.

Those are to my mind the basic problems on which the peace and security of the peoples depend.

But are they solvable? Perhaps the war concerns and government quarters in the NATO countries will simply block agreement on disarmament, and it is therefore useless talking about it?

No, this is not easy to do in our time. For today, what with the nuclear missile weapons, no sober-minded person on earth is blind to the need for disarmament. The problem of disarmament has transcended the limits of diplomatic discussion. It has become a problem of life and death for whole states, for every family, and every man and woman. Nobody should ignore the will of the people, and sacrifice them frankly for the sake of profits for the munitions concerns and adventurist plans.

Furthermore, and this is the main point, the balance of forces in the modern world has changed radically. The odds are no longer with the imperialist powers. It is not they who determine the trend of international politics today. The scales of history are tipping more and more in favour of the socialist countries, who are supported by all the other peace-loving nations. In these circumstances, some leaders in the West are beginning to realise that a nuclear missile war will not spare them and their property.

There is good reason to say that the prospects of disarmament are hopeful. The obstacles to the solution of this problem can be overcome; they are sure to crumble under the pressure of the peoples, the pressure of the forces of historical progress, and then new and radiant opportunities will open to the world.

In his Report to the Twenty-Second Congress of the C.P.S.U., N. S. Khrushchov said that it is possible "to rule

out war for ever from the life of society already in the lifetime of our generation.”

But to make this a reality, the peace-loving public in all countries will have to pull together.

\* \* \*

We have reviewed some of the aspects of the disarmament problem and heard various opinions. However, one thing unites these opinions, and that is their concern for the future of the world, for the basis on which relations between peoples will be built. There is no other way but peaceful coexistence.

The Communists do not need war. This is again stressed most emphatically in the Party Programme adopted by the Soviet Communists at their Twenty-Second Congress. What is more, Communists see it as their historical mission to establish peace all over the world. Ideas are not spread by force of arms. Improvement of the people's welfare, development of culture and science, unprecedented all-round progress—these are the factors that are helping communism to win. Peace, and peace alone, is what it needs. While recognising struggle in the field of ideology, Communists firmly uphold disarmament and peaceful coexistence. They deny the fatal inevitability of war and reject resort to arms as a means of settling international disputes.

Indeed, in a world without arms mutual distrust between peoples would disappear for ever. The states with different social systems would have no other way of living together on our planet but the way of mutual respect, equality, and good-neighbour relations, while peaceful competition in the satisfaction of the various needs of people would be the only way of proving which system is better.

Disarmament will place colossal material and spiritual means at the service of all mankind and of its every member in accordance with his reasonable individual interests. It will open up remarkable prospects for the development of the countries that have freed themselves from colonial oppression.



It is not only the economic assistance of the industrial countries, but the very atmosphere of mutual confidence and respect in international relations, that are important to their future. Full of strength and energy, the young independent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America will make rapid progress.

The development of mankind on the basis of peaceful coexistence will have a beneficial effect on the psychology of people, and above all the younger generation. Relieved from the fear of atomic death and lack of confidence in the future, young people will devote all their strength to constructive labour, to the progressive development of science, to the conquest of the secrets of nature.

Disarmament and peaceful coexistence—what boundless vistas they open to mankind! Freedom, Equality, Fraternity, Happiness, Labour and Peace, peace for all time. Would that not be a victory for Humanism, a triumph for Reason?



HX 632 A1 W9 NO-538  
WORLD COMMUNISM IN THE 20TH  
CENTURY A COLLECTION OF  
PAMPHLETS ACCOMPANIED BY A  
39268382 HSS



\*000003982873\*

HX 632 A1 W9 no.538  
World communism in the 20th  
century.

0172047A MAIN

**РАЗОРУЖЕНИЕ**  
**9 ВОПРОСОВ И ОТВЕТОВ**

**ISSUED BY FOREIGN LANGUAGES  
PUBLISHING HOUSE**