

## ON DISARMAMENT AND BANNING OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The feverish armament race, the invention, manufacture and huge stockpiling of nuclear bombs, the setting up of thousands of military bases all over the globe, the forging of aggressive military alliances and blocs and the rapid militarisation of the economies in the present era are the products of monopoly capitalism in its desperate bid to escape its destined and impending doom.

In the face of this ever-growing menace of arms drive of the imperialists, the socialist states are duty bound to develop their armed might to defend their states against any imperialist aggression and to defend the cause of world socialist revolution and peace. It is also the duty of the world socialist and peace forces to fight against the imperialists' arms expansion and war drive and raise the demand for general disarmament. While not forgetting the fact that the imperialists would not agree to such a total and general disarmament, since carrying it out would tanta-

mount to voluntary liquidation of imperialism, the international Communist movement and the world socialist camp will have to carry on the campaign for disarmament in order to mobilise world public opinion against the menace, to expose the imperialists and also to compel the imperialists either to restrain their arms drive or even to accept some partial agreements.

But the socialist campaign for general and total disarmament should guard itself against sowing any illusions on this score, illusions that the imperialists have been weakened to such an extent that they would be willing to accept general disarmament and to abandon the arms drive and military build-up. The modern revisionists, contrary to this correct concept, carry on the disarmament campaign in so pacifist a manner as to breed the worst illusions about the imperialists; they paint the picture of total and general disarmament being an immediate and practical possibility; they do not hesitate to make absurd statements such as that even the USA's escalation of war against Vietnam does not come in the way of continuation of talks for disarmament; and they, instead of exposing the imperialists and their armaments drive, tend to disarm the people ideologically and politically by lulling their vigilance against imperialism and its menacing preparations for war.

The ridiculous length to which this pacifist, non-class and revisionist concept of disarmament has reached can be clearly seen in how the Soviet leaders have been dealing with the issue of test-ban treaty and of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the banning of nuclear weapons. It is true that there exists a possibility of banning nuclear weapons and a sustained struggle to achieve the same will have to be conducted. Such a struggle against the imperialists can be conducted effectively, only when the socialist camp possesses adequate atomic equipment and technical know-how and is capable of rebuffing the atomic blackmail of the imperialists, and then only the possibilities of preventing an atomic war and the banning of nuclear weapons can have the chance of becoming a reality. Otherwise the imperialists have no reason to accept the proposal and lose the advantage of blackmailing the weaker states and the socialist camp. It is exactly on these premises that the

Soviet Union was compelled to embark upon the manufacture of atomic and hydrogen weapons, and the adequate atomic defence and offence capacity at the disposal of the Soviet Union has resulted in the exercising of certain restraint, circumspection and care on the part of the imperialists in withholding the actual use of these weapons unlike what they did in 1945 during the war against Japan.

But the Soviet leaders, under the pretext of the struggle they are waging for disarmament, non-proliferation and banning of atomic weapons, tore up the agreement concluded with socialist China to provide it with atomic technical know-how, and thus sought to prevent People's China from acquiring atomic weapons. Strange arguments are advanced in defence of this perfidious act of one socialist state against another fraternal socialist state, that such a sharing of technical know-how would facilitate the U. S. monopolists in equipping the West German militarists and other imperialists, that it would give a fillip to the atomic race, that it would place unbearable and heavy burdens on the Chinese people, and that it is unnecessary for any other socialist state to possess atomic weapons since the Soviet Union has got more than enough in its possession not only to defend itself but also to defend every country in the world which is threatened with U.S. atomic attack.

Further, the Soviet leaders, in open conflict with and opposition to socialist China, concluded a test-ban treaty and is proceeding to conclude a so-called treaty of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons along with the U.S. and British imperialists. They did everything in their power to mobilise the signatures of the states in the world, and tomtomed their conclusion of the test-ban treaty in 1963 as a great victory in the struggle for the non-proliferation and banning of nuclear weapons. The Soviet leaders risked a rift and even split in the socialist camp over the issue.

Life and experience have demonstrated beyond a shadow of doubt that this entire line and outlook emanates from a non-class and right-opportunist understanding of the entire disarmament issue, springs from impermissible illusions about the imperialists on the question of preserving peace and banning of atomic weapons, and arises from, not fraternal, but a patronising attitude to other socialist states.

What is the sum total of all this? Neither do atomic technical know-how and manufacturing and stockpiling of bombs remain any more the monopoly of the USA, USSR and Britain, nor is proliferation of atomic weapons prevented. No sovereign and self-respecting nation, whose economy is viable, would ever reconcile itself to the idea of its independence being guarded by either a nuclear USA or nuclear USSR.

Objectively speaking, the attitude of the Soviet leaders on the entire issue is based on the unwarranted premise that their collaboration with the Anglo-American imperialists is a greater guarantee for the preservation of peace, for the outlawing of the use of atomic weapons, and for averting a thermo-nuclear war, than the unity of the entire socialist camp, its economic, political, military might and its all-round development, and its unrelenting struggle against imperialism on every front. How else can it be characterised except as the crassest right opportunism and revisionism?