

**[Speech by First Secretary of the Polish United Workers' Party, Wladyslaw
Gomulka on February 4, 1960]**

Dear Comrade Chairman!

Dear Comrades!

I would like to thank our Soviet hosts for their initiative to convene the present conference of the Warsaw Treaty's Political Consultative Committee, for the excellent preparation of the conference, and for their hospitality.

The initiative to convene our conference takes place at the most appropriate time. The Warsaw Treaty Organization can provide further proofs of its peaceful nature – all the more since the Soviet Union and all the Treaty's members are presenting them at the time when all sober-minded people, including those in the West, have to admit that the correlation of forces has shifted significantly toward our camp – the camp of socialist states.

It is not easy to defend the concept that was propagated until recently by the West: that our countries must fear the supposedly devastating "deterrent power" of the West, that the policy of the Atlantic bloc was allegedly keeping the USSR and the entire socialist camp in check. U.S. Secretary of Defense [Thomas S.] Gates, who recently asserted before [a U.S.] Senate committee that the United States had an advantage over the Soviet Union in nuclear forces, exposed himself to severe criticism and expressions of doubt even in the United States. But, not so long ago, such a conviction constituted the fundamental element of American political philosophy. It was still in place in May 1958, when we last met at a session of the Political Consultative Committee.

I think that it is sufficient to refer to what has been stated in the draft declaration produced by our hosts, which correctly and convincingly points out the changes in the global correlation of forces that characterize today's political situation. In this situation, our countries can continue to fruitfully develop our assiduous and consistent campaign to maintain peace. We have unfailing support for our struggle in the Soviet Union's unprecedented achievements in science, technology, and economics; in the rapid development of the People's Republic of China, and also in the progress that all the socialist states have reported. We have

unfailing support in the power of our policy of peace, the unity of the socialist camp, and in our Marxist-Leninist ideology, which serves as a directive for our concerted efforts aimed at the peace and progress of mankind.

The policy of peaceful coexistence between countries with different political and social systems, which stems from our ideology, has already brought results. What's more, the principle of peaceful coexistence, which the politicians and ideologues of imperialist countries until recently considered an alleged fabrication of a so-called "communist propaganda," has been accepted by citizens in the West. It would be very difficult for a serious politician from the West to become offended by the idea of peaceful coexistence, unless he wants to discredit himself in the eyes of public opinion in his own country.

This does not mean, however, that the spokesmen for "the Cold War" and a policy "from a position of strength" have given up on their hostile political plans against our countries. Their influence has diminished in the United States and in many Western nations, but it is still significant.

In addition to these strong proponents of "Cold War," there are also other forces that do not support this policy, but are afraid of peaceful coexistence for various reasons. They fear the economic consequences of the rapid progress of peaceful coexistence, the growing strength of progressive forces under the conditions of peaceful stabilization, or lastly, the consolidation of national liberation movements in countries where they have political and economic interests. When we speak about the forces of Cold War, we must of course mention the military circles in the United States, NATO military circles, and the political forces of unrest in the world that depend and count upon support from NATO military circles.

The political forces of unrest are, first and foremost, the governing circles in West Germany, [West German Chancellor Konrad] Adenauer and the forces that constitute his support in his country. After all, their policy was born in an atmosphere of "Cold War." Under conditions of permanent peaceful coexistence, the foundations of this policy must disappear; under such conditions, the FRG's role will be cut down to such limits and such levels that correspond to the FRG's real position in the current global correlation of forces today. Today, it is truly exaggerated due to

the political and military schemes upon which Atlantic¹ strategy are based and which are bound up with the FRG.

The forces of political unrest also include those political and military circles in Japan which have bound up their policies with the strengthening of the [U.S.] position and American bases on the Japanese islands as part of a policy directed against the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

Despite the fact that forces hostile to peace exist and are at work, we have begun the year 1960 with a balance sheet whose assets speak on our behalf, on behalf of peace, and which constitute a real basis for success in our further efforts for peace.

The Soviet proposal for universal and complete disarmament created a new situation in the field of disarmament, a situation in which an open negation of the Soviet proposal became impossible. Discussion of it became a necessity in light of the fact that it was put forward by a power whose enormous achievements astonished the entire world, and that the masses around the world have become fed up with the arms race.

Our camp presented to the world a clear thesis, which is fully supported by facts. Armament has become outdated; it has ceased to be profitable.

Given this situation, the reactions in various centers of the West are significant.

The historic visit of Comrade Khrushchev in the United States undoubtedly had an enormous influence upon the change of the public opinion in that country.

The government of the United States, which was preparing to release last October a lengthy study of around 1000 pages that would justify to the public the American position on disarmament to date, decided to halt its publication. This shows how strong an impression the Soviet proposal for universal and complete disarmament must have made.

¹ Transl. Note: NATO.

A serious review of positions took place within the American government, and as a result, new frictions emerged. This pertains especially to differences between the White House, the Department of State, and the Pentagon. The same goes with regard to the current situation in important business circles. We know, for example, that while some leading representatives of the arms industry in the United States have been exerting pressure on the government to continue the arms race, another group of its representatives has begun to work on a gradual conversion of this industry.

It is worth mentioning that the American government has not been able up to now to counter the Soviet proposal with any kind of constructive plan for disarmament. But, then again, the American government, in order to save its position in world opinion, announced last December that it is working on such a plan.

With regard to Great Britain, the plan of Selwyn Lloyd, presented to the UN the day before Comrade Khrushchev's speech, turned out to be a flop. However, public pressure in Great Britain on the government to play a more active role in disarmament negotiations has been growing stronger, especially since the burden of armaments for the British economy has turned out to be unbearable over the long run. This is why the British position at the moment shows some flexibility, especially in comparison to the other Western powers.

France's position on disarmament reflects its internal contradictions, especially the contradiction between its actual capabilities and its ambitions. This explains, on the one hand, its unrealistic conception of prioritizing a ban on the means of delivery for nuclear weapons and, on the other hand, its more realistic stance on inspections.

Adenauer's position on disarmament constitutes an issue in and of itself. Adenauer, who spoke on several occasions about the universal disarmament, replied to the Soviet disarmament proposal with the following facts: an intensification of armament, including with missiles and preparations for nuclear armament. Bonn's cold war policy is perhaps best represented by Herr [Franz-Josef] Strauss, who called "the spirit of Camp David" a "communist propaganda trick" at the NATO Council session in Paris. Comrade Khrushchev gave a devastating reply to these and other maneuvers by Bonn in his recent letter to Adenauer.

The best illustration of the contradictions in the Atlantic camp was the stormy course of the last NATO Council session, which did not lead to a unified stance regarding any of the fundamental issues. One could see the mutual recriminations regarding the failure of Atlantic policy.

The serious mobilization of the forces favoring [peaceful] coexistence, along with the growing contradictions [within the capitalist camp], have only strengthened the impact of the Soviet disarmament plan. Its grandness and the prospects that it raises reflect the strength of our camp. Our meeting today is a manifestation of our full and wholehearted support for this plan. The draft declaration draft that we will adopt today states this.

At the same time, I would like to welcome as wholeheartedly as I can the Soviet Unions significant step to reduce unilaterally its armed forces by one-third. This has undoubted significance for the creation of a conducive atmosphere for the success of the May summit meeting. The draft declaration provides a response to all those who would like to diminish the meaning of the Soviet initiative or to outright pervert its sense. Contrary to such distortions, the decision of the USSR was received by world opinion as a new act of goodwill and a grand gesture of a great power.

By mobilizing public opinion in favor of the Soviet disarmament plan, we will be acting in favor of improving the international situation. Undoubtedly, other significant moves can also serve the same purpose. The draft declaration will mention, in particular, "the conclusion of bilateral agreements on non-aggression between states belonging to different military alliances, as well as the creation of a zone free of nuclear weapons and missiles in Europe."

The second vital issue that lies before us at today's conference is the issue of a peace treaty with Germany. And rightly so. Given that two German states exist with different systems and opposing directions of political development, the conclusion of a peace treaty is the only realistic, current possibility for resolving the German question.

The treaty will simultaneously regulate the tumid problem of West Berlin, an issue of great importance to our countries, and especially to the German Democratic Republic.

The treaty is all the more significant since it will undermine the position of the revanchist and militaristic elements in West Germany and it will take the wind out of their sails by confirming clearly and unequivocally the German borders.

The draft declaration correctly underscores the inviolability of the western borders of Poland and Czechoslovakia. The fact remains that even though the FRG refuses to recognize our borders, the conviction is growing in the world, including within the FRG itself, that our borders cannot be changed.

Adenauer is arousing chauvinistic sentiments within the FRG regarding the borders. And not only with regard to this issue.

Recent developments in West Germany have revealed in particular the right-wing and nationalistic elements that Adenauer has long supported and nurtured. Who else could constitute a better support for the FRG's cold war policy if not him?

This policy and its recent manifestations have deepened the FRG's isolation within the Western alliance. Adenauer is speculating, however, that the Western alliance cannot abandon the FRG due to the importance of its position. In the current international situation, he wants to see only a temporary lessening of tensions; he is counting on the fact that the favorable situation for his policy will return after the presidential elections in the United States, and to this end, his allies in various Washington circles will help him out.

The current political situation has led to a certain differentiation of positions among the Western powers regarding Bonn's policy. In England, for example, anti-FRG sentiments are seriously on the rise; these sentiments have arisen for various reasons and from various foundations. However, Adenauer is counting on the fact that London – which aspires to weaken the FRG – cannot go beyond a certain limit, beyond which playing on the contradictions between the West European states ceases to be effective.

Given this situation, our task is to unmask the real face of Bonn's policy and in this way to contribute to the FRG's further isolation.

At the same time, our task is to achieve our number-one postulate regarding the conclusion of a peace treaty with both German states. If this turns out to be

impossible, then we are prepared to conclude a peace treaty with the GDR, which would simultaneously solve the West Berlin problem.

Comrades!

The declaration that we adopt today will be an important instrument for us in achieving our efforts to resolve the main problems of the current epoch.

On March 15, a newly-constituted Disarmament Committee consisting of 10 nations will begin its work in Geneva.

We must count on the fact that the Western states – seeking to delay decisions regarding disarmament – will try to divert the discussion to secondary and insignificant problems.

As you know, Poland is a member of this Committee. I would like to assure you, Comrades, that the Polish delegation in this 10-nation Committee will not spare any effort to counter such sort of attempts. We will be guided in our work in the Committee by the resolutions in the declaration that we are adopting today.

The most important event, however, which lies ahead of us, is the May summit meeting. It will take place thanks to the consistent policy of the USSR. We fully support the Soviet position, which has been hammered out by Comrade Khrushchev. Comrade Khrushchev will be defending not only the Soviet Union but also Poland and all the states of our camp at the meeting. He will be defending world peace. We wish you, Comrade Khrushchev, all the best and success in your important and weighty mission.

[Translation by Margaret (Małgorzata) K. Gnoinska]