

1982**The New Hungarian Peace Movement****Citation:**

"The New Hungarian Peace Movement", 1982, Wilson Center Digital Archive, Ferenc Koszegi and E.P. Thompson, END Special Report, European Nuclear Disarmament and the Merlin Press, 1982. Contributed to NPIHP by Matthew Evangelista. Reproduced with the permission of Ben Thompson, Kate Thompson, and the Merlin Press,
<http://www.merlinpress.co.uk>
<https://wilson-center-digital-archive.dvincitest.com/document/113738>

Summary:

Pamphlet from European Nuclear Disarmament containing two articles by Hungarian activist Ferenc Koszegi detailing the rise of independent peace groups within Hungary. Koszegi describes the make-up of the groups (mostly ages 14-20 and in secondary schools, along with religious groups) and problems for their growth and effectiveness, including the potential co-option by the existing state peace council and outside manipulation. He argues that the groups should increase communication networks and open dialogue with the west in order to survive and prosper. The pamphlet also contains the transcript of a speech delivered by E.P. Thompson to an independent peace group in Budapest advocating for such peace groups and the transcending of Cold War rhetoric for the purpose of nuclear disarmament.

Original Language:

English

Contents:

Original Scan

Original Scan
END SPECIAL REPORT:

**THE NEW HUNGARIAN
PEACE MOVEMENT**

Ferenc Köszegi and E P Thompson



Published jointly by
European Nuclear Disarmament
227 Seven Sisters Road, London N4
and The Merlin Press Ltd
3 Manchester Road, London E14

Printed by Black Rose
30 Clerkenwell Close
London EC1

Typesetting by H. Hems
The Malt House, Chilmark, Wilts.

Cover design by Louis Mackay

Materials in this pamphlet are © European Nuclear Disarmament, Ferenc Köszegi and E.P. Thompson. END wishes to help the international peace movement to make these materials widely known and will be glad to arrange terms for foreign rights. Please contact Jane Dibblin, END, 227 Seven Sisters Road, London N4.

The independent Hungarian peace movement is interested in receiving materials and visits from Western peace activists. They are particularly interested in opening correspondence with schools and universities peace movements, but they cannot at this stage be deluged with visits and correspondence. If you wish to exchange letters, please write in the first place to: Andrew White, 41 Hodford Road, London NW11 8NL.



The symbol and badge of the New Hungarian Peace Movement

FOREWORD

'Does a genuinely autonomous peace movement actually exist in Hungary?', Ferenc Köszegi asks in the first of his two important articles in this pamphlet. The answer is a confident 'yes'. But its existence and operation have to be understood in terms of a set of conditions which are very different from those to which we are accustomed in the Western peace movement. Some of these conditions apply with equal force to all societies over on the 'other side' of the East/West divide. Others are peculiar to Hungarian national circumstances and to the comparatively 'liberal' and flexible stance of the Hungarian authorities.

These conditions take a little time to understand. The Western peace movement ought not to expect an instant adoption of its own recipes or forms of activity in the East. Köszegi provides the best possible guide for our understanding, and his thoughtful accounts are intended to provoke 'dialogue' between our movements, not instant identity.

All the same, a little background explanation will be helpful. In a further important article* Ferenc Köszegi and István Szent-Iványi discuss the 'Struggle around an Idea' which underlies the new movement:

This is the first time in decades that the two halves of Europe have interested themselves so much in each other. We have not met with such a degree of interest for a long time. This interest is more than simple curiosity. Those West Europeans who are beginning a dialogue are tied to living relations with East Europeans, since no serious result in the field of the peace campaign can be reached without cooperation. And, if 'the waves of the peace movement stop at the gates of Vienna', then, after a time, this will mean that Western movements have been in vain; it will prove that in Eastern Europe there is no genuine desire for spontaneous movements.

* *New Society*, 21 & 28th October, 1982 (offprints available from END office).

ERRATUM

Page 50

Sentence beginning "And this would bring about..." should read:

And this would bring about, as no kind of provocation but as a normal event, the entire withdrawal of foreign military presence and bases, first from Central Europe (including West Germany), and next from our continent: to be specific, of Soviet forces and bases from East Europe and of American forces and bases from the West.

In the last analysis it will vindicate those who have maintained, from the start, that the single and exclusive aim of peace movements is the weakening of the defensive capacity of the West. . .

But it is in the nature of most communist societies, with a centralised political and ideological life, that there should only be a marginal space permitted to autonomous activities: 'spontaneity' itself may be suspected (around whatever issue) since it might pass beyond centralised Party control. This has applied also in the area of 'peace movements': that is, official Peace Committees or Councils (normally affiliated to the World Peace Council) might be founded upon the genuine desire of the people for peace, but their work should be seen as that of engaging in informal diplomatic relations with Western opinion. Such an official Council might perhaps be compared with Chatham House (in certain of its activities): that is, a semi-official institution, sometimes a forum for informal and flexible discussion, but essentially existing to forward the diplomatic aims of one side only, and without any pretence to autonomy or spontaneity.

These organisations (Köszegi and Szent-Iványi argue) had come to receive the 'suspicion of citizens' and this evoked a 'neutral social attitude' to the peace movement at the time of the first Cold War:

In the Peoples' Democracies of Eastern Europe, the peace movement had fundamentally discredited itself by the end of the forties and the beginning of the fifties. At that time, instead of the neutral term 'peace movement' the expression used was 'peace struggle', which was intended to camouflage the scarcely-concealed preparations in expectation of a Third World War. Gradually the militant 'peace struggle' lost its original meaning and became a euphemism for armament, expansion and a policy of intimidation. The term further lost significance and credibility because, with the passing of time, it was used in relation to everything. Everywhere it was used in a manner which radically distorted its original meaning—a familiar example is the rhyme:

Collect your scrap, your iron send:
With these too your peace defend!

Köszegi and Szent-Iványi give an unflattering account of the response of certain official Councils to the new peace movements in the West. In some countries these Peace Committees were regarded only as 'transmission belts of state or Party policy'. The purest, 'almost ideal-type form' of such an official movement is taken from Romania:

On the first of November 1981 a national campaign against armaments was launched. Quickly, throughout the country, in every factory, workshop, state farm and office 'mass meetings' were held in line with the published directives. These sharply condemned the arms race and forwarded their resolutions to the Party's central organs. The national campaign was concluded, on December 6th, with a huge rally. . . The personal composition of the delegations was decided after careful deliberation by the institute, factory, workshop and state farm Party committees. Although participation at the rally was only on the basis of personal invitation or as a member of one of the delegations, the security forces were represented in large numbers. In all, 300,000 people gathered in Bucharest's Republic Square and listened to the Party Secretary, N. Ceausescu's, thirty-five minute speech.

In Hungary the political and ideological climate is altogether less centralised and repressive. There is more space for discussion and even for autonomous initiatives. The Hungarian National Peace Council has shown more flexibility, both in response to the movement stirring among Hungary's youth and to the Western peace movement. This has opened a space in which the new independent peace movement is arising. It is a movement of the young, which is in dialogue both with the official Peace Council and with the non-aligned peace movements (like CND, END and IKV) in the West. It is a sensitive and difficult space since, as Köszegi and Szent-Iványi write, 'the centres of power are constantly filled with alarm at the possibility that a peace movement. . . beyond their control might have a magnetic effect on oppositional elements, and might, in time, become a centre of opposition'. Moreover, the tenderness of the authorities towards this development results from the fear that an opposition could spring up under the 'guise' of officially-supported goals:

Such an initiative would put the respective governments in a most uncomfortable position, because, while on the one hand they very much agree with and support every Western peace movement, and recognise their demands as legitimate, they could not be so indulgent towards the wishes of a spontaneous domestic peace movement, if only because of the ties of their alliances.

The new peace movement, then, is arising in an extremely sensitive situation, within a delicate balance of both internal and external forces. It is well that the Western peace movement should appreciate this, and not rush into the space with amateurish enthusiasm. The wisest heads in the new peace movement (and they are very wise) are fully aware of the precarious position which the new movement occupies. This is one of the questions which Ferenc Kőszegi writes to us about.

He writes with complete openness. Everything is placed on the table without reserve. Hungary is a remarkably open society, today, in terms of the ideas which circulate widely in discussion groups, in the universities, in the schools. There is a delicate line between activities which are 'semi-legal'—that is, ideas and causes which may be canvassed informally, in small groups, but which may not be fully expressed in public meetings or in print; and 'semi-illegal' activities, which are regarded by the authorities as 'oppositional', such as *samizdat* (unauthorised duplicated publication, circulating usually in a few copies only) or 'underground university' lectures. 'Semi-illegal' activities may meet the harassment and interference of various kinds from the authorities. (An excellent survey of the current state of the 'democratic opposition' in Hungary (by Bill Lomax) will be found in *Labour Focus on Eastern Europe*, summer 1982.)

This democratic opposition includes many distinguished writers and intellectuals, some of whom are also anxious for a dialogue with the Western peace movement: a two-sided dialogue, of course, in which their own proposals are listened to with care. I am especially grateful to my friend, Miklos Hirásti, the writer, and to Laszlo Rajk. An example of a (sharp) peace initiative of their own will be seen below, p. 32. There are many other names and voices in Hungary's plural discourse, and there is a vibrant political and artistic

life in Budapest. One other important voice, long in dialogue with us in the West, is Mr András Hegédus, the former Prime Minister, now a widely-respected independent, and a signatory to the original END Appeal. While I was in Budapest my lecture on 'Beyond the Cold War' was published in semi-illegal *samizdat*.

There are some differences as to policies and strategies within this new discourse. That is what we should expect: it is the same over here. These are discussed by Kőszegi. They are differences in which we should not intervene, and they will be settled much better without us. They lie along the official/unofficial and the 'semi-legal'/'semi-illegal' hairline.

Andrew White of Cambridge END and I went to Budapest in late September, on the particular invitation of the 'Peace Group for Dialogue'. We did not wear cloaks and we did not carry daggers. Other visitors from END and IKV had preceded us. We went on a perfectly normal visit to exchange views with fellow workers for peace, and we made it clear that we wished to talk with anyone, official or unofficial, who shared our objectives. Although the authorities might have preferred it if our visit had been under the auspices of the official Peace Council, relations were courteous and proper and no difficulties were placed in our way. I found it to be a good deal easier to enter and leave Hungary than I sometimes find it to be to enter the United States.

After four days Andrew and I were in no doubt whatsoever about the reality of the new peace movement in Hungary. We were surprised, above all, by two things. First, the extraordinary and rising support among young people, many of whom wear the CND or other 'Western' peace badges (but CND's is now universal). This dramatic mood of peace—and desire to communicate with us in the West—is perhaps strongest of all in the secondary schools, in the age-group 14 to 18. Second, the remarkable knowledge and the mature judgment of our hosts in the Peace Group for Dialogue. Ferenc Kőszegi himself, and his wife, Borbála, are both young graduates (specialising one in history and the other in problems of the mentally-retarded); others are graduates

and students, school students, young artists, and young working people. They have total dedication to our common work for peace, and great organising flair. Fuller accounts of the new movement will be published in the November *END Bulletin* and successive numbers. These are our sisters and our brothers, and in the next year or two, we will come to know them well. They are in the very front place, and the most exposed place, of our European work for peace. They have adopted the principle of complete openness. We were proud to bring back the new badge of the movement (which appears on our cover) in our lapels.

The badge shows the CND badge in Hungarian colours in the form of two clasped hands. One hand is theirs: the other is our own. And I must explain one little incident which took place while in Budapest which in the hands of certain Western correspondents might have been made into some cold war 'drama'. I had been invited by the group to give a public lecture while in Budapest, and (somewhat to my surprise) it was suggested that I might take up themes from 'Beyond the Cold War'. I readily agreed, and the authorities in the University kindly signified that a lecture-theatre would be available. But on arrival in Budapest it turned out that there were difficulties in obtaining a public place for the lecture. I had more than one discussion with officials and members of the National Peace Council, in which they kindly invited me to give the lecture, but on their own premises and before an invited audience. I was, of course, willing to accept their invitation: but (as I explain in the lecture) I felt obliged, by commitments made in my writings and before audiences of the peace movement in West Europe, to say that I could only do so if I was also permitted to give the lecture, under the auspices of my hosts, in a public place.

In the event the arrangement proved to be impossible. I met with no discourtesy and relations with the Peace Council were proper: more than that, I was entertained by them to an excellent lunch at which we had a very frank and unreserved exchange of views. But our friends in the independent peace movement still wished the lecture to take place, even if a public place could not be obtained. I therefore

delivered it, through the great hospitality of one of Hungary's leading novelists, Mr George Konrád, in his private apartment. Despite the somewhat short notice (only two hours) some eighty attended the lecture—mainly young people—which was in any case as many as could occupy the floor-space of our generous hosts.

I wish to emphasise that this was not a dramatic or furtive event but one which we considered to be perfectly *normal*. It is normal and right that peace people in every part of Europe should find each other and enter into dialogue. If certain among the authorities were uneasy about my lecture, then I recall that there are authorities on this side—including within the BBC—who have shown unease also. Our hosts suggested that my lecture be included in this pamphlet, not because they agreed with all parts of it, but because this will symbolise the new stage of 'dialogue', the two clasped hands.

E.P.T.



Ferenc Köszegi

THE MAKING OF THE NEW PEACE MOVEMENT IN HUNGARY

by Ferenc Köszegi

Does a genuinely autonomous peace movement actually exist in Hungary? In posing this question it must be borne in mind that it would be misleading to apply West European standards to the Hungarian situation. The peace movement in Hungary must be thought of in terms of small cell-groups in various universities and secondary schools, which may be only very loosely organised, if at all. Unfortunately the lines of communication between these groups have been tenuous at best. Whether these small cell-groups can be organised into a movement will have to depend mostly on indigenous initiatives. But support from the peace movement in the West can also be of decisive importance.

An interlocking system of common interests between East and West can and must be strengthened. As Tony Benn has said: '... unless Europe can get together it could easily be sucked into the global power struggle now intensifying between the USA and the USSR, perhaps triggered off by events as far apart as Afghanistan or El Salvador. It will take a long time for Europeans to identify and develop a basis of cooperation strong enough to supersede the present pattern of division, suspicion and hostility.'¹ If this goal is to be achieved, the new East-European peace movement could play a very significant role.

I

Representatives of some small peace-oriented cell-groups, along with other individuals, held a little 'conference' on June 12th of this year in Budapest. The main topic under discussion was the question of attending and participating in the forthcoming Vienna Festival. Other items crystallised around two other issues: our attitude toward the 'official'

peace movement, and our need for a comprehensive discussion of our future plans.

As would be expected, there were dissenting voices in regard to the very possibility of a new peace movement in Hungary. Those expressing this opinion felt that the role of these groups was simply to act as a catalyst for complaints about the condition in East Europe and would be likely to end in some sort of theatrical demonstration, showing the world once more that freedom of choice does not exist here. Such views naturally deflated some of the enthusiasm, but these opinions have neither been ignored nor silenced. We are trying very hard to find a balance between those who are more enthusiastic and those who, for theoretical reasons, regard the idea of a new peace movement with extreme reserve. We have agreed to practise among ourselves the spirit of the *Berlin Appeal*, where it states that:

. . . the question of peace [must] be discussed in an atmosphere of tolerance and recognition of the right of free expression. Every spontaneous public expression of the desire for peace should be supported and encouraged.²

Although it would not be right to speak of a new peace 'movement' in the normal sense of that term, the phenomenon is spreading rapidly and is strong enough already to be a main topic in intellectual discussion in Hungary.

Various names have sprung up to describe this new movement, and it is difficult to tell where they come from. The new peace movement is called unofficial, non-official, autonomous, spontaneous, grass roots, dissident, oppositionist. These names carry with them a strong flavour of political prejudice, and even the desire to manipulate. In an over-politicised society, the label given to an infant phenomenon can be of great importance in terms of public attitude, at home and abroad, towards it, as well as the type of persons who will gravitate towards it once it comes into the public eye. In the present circumstances, the simple designation, 'new peace movement', is perhaps the most value-neutral, and therefore the best term to employ in describing the various social forces which are gathering themselves together

under the banner of peace.

The religious and secular elements in this movement are in agreement that nuclear catastrophe is our greatest enemy. In spite of differences of religious and/or political beliefs, a moral consensus has asserted itself as to the need for joint action to prevent nuclear war.

Most interesting is the age of the participants. Those who are most active, enthusiastic, and almost naively candid in their opinions are the 14 to 20 year age group. This age group shoulders almost exclusively the initiative in the new peace movement. At the university level there are only small groups involved, while the majority remain indifferent. In the secondary and trade schools, however, there is a flurry of activity which is gaining momentum increasingly.

An example of this is the Anti-Nuclear Campaign Hungary (ANC), a group organised about a year ago in the secondary schools. This organisation has about 100-150 card-carrying members, who have been making their views known through leaflets, drawings, badges, etc. They are genuinely a spearhead in the peace movement. Even the Communist Party daily *Népszabadság* has published one of their placards.² They are gaining popularity among the young because they are truly a spontaneous and independent group. They have a loose organisational framework whose mechanisms are open to inspection. They have many active provincial branches.

The ANC is presently seeking an appropriate connection with the official Hungarian nation-wide Peace Council, which, quite frankly, has lost touch with the common person, as is indicated by the formation of the ANC itself. At the above-mentioned 'conference' one ANC founding member stated that their immediate goal was the abolition of nuclear weapons, but that a long-term goal was the abolition of all weapons. The anti-militarist thrust of the ANC is apparent in their slogan 'Let's Melt the Weapons!'. The ANC is one very important element in what we are here calling the new peace movement.

There are other independent actions in the secondary schools having no relation to the ANC, although these actions are usually short-lived. A central problem is that the spontaneous enthusiasm quickly becomes institutionalised,

which also explains much of the lack of interest in the universities. The response to official lukewarmness in the secondary schools shows a marked tendency toward radicalisation.

There are a few universities in which this new movement is gaining strength. These are mostly the Arts universities where students are perhaps most sensitive and where they have closer connection with the West. There are some contradictions in this movement however, which will be looked at later.⁴

The new movement in Hungary has had two distinct branches. The first branch, in the schools, we have touched on above. Now we must look briefly at the second branch, that of the religious groups involved. Some of this we have touched on in the paper cited above (see note 4). Since the writing of that paper there have been some new developments, and new information has become available.

While the student movement has been dealing exclusively with disarmament, the religious groups, called *base communities*, have been concerned mainly with militarism in general. Having first appeared in the sixties, the base communities are spreading in Hungary. There are now about 300 such communities, each numbering about 30-40 persons. They are against military conscription and are seeking a civilian alternative to military service. They are truly pacifist, and are popular especially among the Catholic laity. Until now, alternative civilian service is available only to small religious groups in Hungary (Nazarines, Jehovah's Witnesses) and there is no precedent for such service being offered to mainline denominations.

The founder of the base community movement in Hungary is György Bulányi, and he has many followers, mostly among young Catholics. There are priests involved in this movement, but the higher clergy have several times condemned their activities. At least one priest, Laszlo Kovács, was condemned by his superiors for his anti-militarist sermons.

These base communities follow the non-violent philosophy of Gandhi and Martin Luther King.

At present there is no relationship between these base

communities and other peace groups. One reason for this is that these communities have been primarily interested in religious renewal and have not expressed themselves on other problems. But the participation of persons from these base communities in the movement for disarmament is one sign that what is developing in Hungary is a truly comprehensive phenomenon.

II

We will now turn our attention to the pressing problems which face the new peace movement in Hungary. The most pressing is the problem of cooption and manipulation.

There are three important forces which would want to coopt and manipulate the new peace movement. The first is the official Hungarian nation-wide Peace Council. Although this organisation has been relatively successful in the past, it has recently lost influence among the young. When the new wave of peace concern crossed the Hungarian border, the Peace Council was quite bewildered. Their confusion was quickly seen by the youth. It was very disillusioning for the youth representatives when they pressed to organise peace rallies that the Council could not answer until it had consulted with the Communist Party. This crippled the Council's credibility in the eyes of the young.

It is noteworthy that there was in early 1982 a shake-up in the leadership of the Council, and a group of young and enthusiastic persons took control of the helm. But this was too late in terms of the new peace movement, which was already well under way. As a result, the Council had no choice but to try to ally itself to the already existing peace movement.

Nevertheless, it must be said that there are common goals between the Council and the new peace movement: total disarmament, creation of a nuclear-free zone in Europe, and the protest against the deployment of Pershing II and SS-20 missiles. The division is mostly one of methods. The Council is a bit clumsy and bureaucratic, and this turns off the young. It also does not really comprehend the deep anti-militarist sentiments of the youth.

In this year the Council has tried several times to coopt

the initiatives of the young. Students' attempts at organising a spontaneous event always ended in the Council's 'official' sponsorship and institutionalisation of the event. Often the youth could hardly distinguish between what was 'their own' action and what was that of the Council.

There is indeed room for cooperation between the new peace movement and the Peace Council. This can in fact be beneficial to the new movement. But the distinctions must also be held. It may be that, in the end, the appearance of this new movement will accomplish nothing other than the revitalisation of the Peace Council. But then, that already is a result of some worth.

The second manipulating force is the so-called 'opposition' or more exactly, the dissidents. In this connection we refer back to our allusions about the contradictions present in the new movement in the universities. Until now, the dissident or opposition elements have been indifferent to the new movement, and took no significant part in its formation. But lately they have been stirred from that indifference by the fact that it seems that 'the masses' are behind this movement. They hope to enlarge their base by means of this movement. What I am saying here applies only to the Hungarian situation, and is my own observation at that. I am not implying that the same holds true for peace movements in other East-European countries. The attempts of the opposition elements to gain prominent places in the emerging movement could be of great danger to the movement itself. If the movement gets itself identified as being primarily or even secondarily a movement of political opposition, this would surely mean a decline in support for it among the larger population.

The slogan *Peace and Freedom* is a valid one, but not in the sense of political opposition. What is meant in this context by *Freedom* is the freedom to choose our fate with regards to nuclear destruction. The one link that unites the new peace movement is the desire for an enduring peace. The new movement has developed into a force which cannot be identified with either the Peace Council or with political opposition. It is and must remain an open and public movement, resisting all attempts at cooption and manipulation.

The third force of manipulation is the State itself, or more exactly Hungarian Constitutional Law. As a formally organised group, the new peace movement has no chance of survival. Constitutional rights are elastic, and it is extremely difficult to claim these rights in any given situation. It is for this reason, among others, that we hesitate to speak of a peace 'movement' as such, but continue to speak only of small and loosely organised groups and/or individuals who feel themselves responsible for the cause of peace. In terms of the Hungarian Constitution, even a group like the ANC is on very shaky ground. Until now, the fact that the group has emphasised peace as its main theme has been its sole protection. There has been until now no direct interference from the authorities in the actions of this group, but there is no assurance that this 'hands off' policy will continue.

But since the socialist countries are officially supporting the peace movement in Western countries, it would be most embarrassing if they were to openly prohibit such developments in their own country. Were the government to move against the new peace movement, this would be a great blow to the peace movement in the Western countries as well, giving the forces of militarism a powerful propaganda weapon with which to influence public opinion. This is a very significant example of how there in fact already exists an interlocking relationship between the peace movements East and West.

The greatest danger in terms of manipulation from this third force focuses on its propaganda efforts. This propaganda steadily discredits all peace movements. In terms of this propaganda, only US armaments exist. This one-sidedness is in itself enough to create indifference towards the peace movement in the eyes of the average Hungarian. As an example of this one-sided propaganda, the Hungarian Foreign Minister stated in a recent speech that:

We have to disintegrate the social base of the militarist circles of imperialism; at the same time we must strengthen those forces which are for peace.

But then he went on to say that:

. . . it is necessary to increase the effectiveness of the strength of the armed forces of peace.⁵

This whole line of argument is rotten at its roots because it is entirely clear from our past experience that increased military spending only heightens the prospects of war. In reality, it is exactly these forces which are working against peace. This is the theory of deterrence, but as E.P. Thompson has said: '. . . deterrence might itself be defined as the biggest and most expensive lie in history.' In a recent Peace Council publication, a Hungarian Army officer stated that:

. . . the doctrine of the socialist military is that if the forces of imperialism unleash a war against socialism, it must inescapably be a world war, a crucial and final clash in which the main aim of both regimes would be the total destruction of the other. This war, by its very nature, would be an intercontinental, global and cosmic atomic war.⁶

Yes, it would indeed be a final clash, but hardly a decisive one, since there would be no winner!

In short, the new peace movement must steer clear of all forces which do not themselves have the characteristic of mass support.

III

We are looking for a political step which can open up new forms of public pressure, and bring into the field of forces new moral resources. Partly this is a matter of ending superpower domination of the most important negotiations.⁸

This statement by Ken Coates states concisely the need to transform the nearly-universal moral and intuitive revulsion against nuclear war and weapons into a political force which will address itself to the powers-that-be. It would be great if this new peace movement could be secure in its own existence.

Let us now summarise briefly.

The peace movement has to formulate its own political profile independent of both the official and the opposition

line. The new movement must take its own stands on the related questions of disarmament, the arms race, and a new economic order with respect to the third world.

The new peace movement has to stand firmly on a pan-European platform. It must seek counterparts in both the East and the West, which could later be expanded between continents. But the transcontinental course is our only course for the time being.

'We must commence to act as if a united, neutral and pacific Europe already exists. We must learn to be loyal, not to "East" or "West", but to each other, and we must disregard the prohibitions and limitations imposed by any national state.'⁹

Third, this transnational course will lead to a renewal in other fields as well. It will help to loosen the ideological rigidity of the East. There is a great demand everywhere in Europe 'for greater openness of exchange, both of persons and of ideas'. In the long run it is not enough only to aim at disarmament. The world is too complex to suppose that disarmament, perhaps the most immediate problem, will suddenly solve every problem we face. The arms race is but one link in the chain, and we must fight equally against fascist and militarist trends. In his *Beyond the Cold War* Thompson states that:

We have to be, in every moment, critics of the adversary posture of the powers. For we are threatened, not only by weapons, but by the ideological and security structures which divide our continent and which turn us into adversaries.¹⁰

Beyond this, there are urgent and important tasks facing the new peace movement in Hungary. We must first of all create a communications network between our various groups. At present these connections are tentative. Such continual connections are necessary in order to mobilise public opinion. In this connection it is intolerable that it is not possible to write and publish articles and news-items concerning this new movement. Urgently needed is a newspaper or bulletin to inform, advise, and be a forum for the new movement.

It is extremely important to wage a campaign against the 'blissful ignorance' of the public in terms of the realities of nuclear war. In Hungary this is especially acute. This can be attributed to the fact that Hungarians, like other peoples, do not really believe that they can change things. And besides that, they think that a nuclear death is quick and relatively clean. Paralleling this attitude is a sort of Armageddon mood. In the past, Hungarians have got used to the idea that their fate is decided outside of their own country. It is important therefore to emphasise the role that can be played in the peace processes by small countries. Against the cynics and sceptics, the new peace movement must develop its own trains of thought and reasoning.

This programme is likely to be opposed both by the Council and by the political opposition. But it is only such a broad-based programme that has any chance of success. What I have outlined here of course is not a manifesto. It should rather be seen as a working-paper, open to amendments, additions and deletions.

IV

In the 'conference' mentioned in our opening section of this paper, several proposals were made in the context of Western initiatives. These are as follows:

1. A nuclear-free Eastern Europe as a direct step towards a nuclear-free world.
2. There has been no success with disarmament talks between the blocs. It will be useful then to initiate *individual disarmament* voluntarily. This means that individuals from the blocs would voluntarily disarm themselves, so that for example, one Hungarian soldier would leave the army if one Belgian soldier did the same. It would be a sort of 'soldier's exchange' programme! This would help to emphasise the responsibility of the individual and could be controlled by an international task-force set up for that purpose.
3. Perhaps the cause of peace will be the first opportunity for Europeans to unite themselves into a close partnership. It is urgent to set up a task-force for the purpose of exploiting this opportunity. We expect that our mutual concerns will grow more numerous.

NOTES

1. Tony Benn: *Towards a United Democratic and Socialist Europe*, END Papers Two, Spokesman, 1982, p. 97.
2. *Berlin Appeal*.
3. *Népszabadság*, 1982, May 11.
4. For a closer examination, see Ferenc Köszegi and István Szt. Iványi: 'Struggle Around an Idea', *New Society*, 21 & 28 October, 1982.
5. *Az Enyhülésért*, Scientific Conference in Kecskemét, Budapest 1981, p. 13.
6. E.P. Thompson: *Protest and Survive*, Penguin Books, 1981, p. 19.
7. *A Tudomány felelősége a nukleáris katasztrófa elhárításában*, Országos Béketanács Tudományos Bizottsága, Budapest 1982, p. 61.
8. Ken Coates, 'For a Nuclear-free Europe', in Thompson/Smith (eds.) *Protest and Survive*, Penguin Books, 1981, pp. 231-32.
9. E.P. Thompson: *Beyond the Cold War*, Merlin Press, London, 1982, p. 26.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 33.

THE 'PEACE GROUP FOR DIALOGUE' IN HUNGARY

by Ferenc Köszegi

Perhaps there is no other peace movement in Europe, which is as anxious to restrict itself, to hold itself back, or to try to underrate itself as does the new Hungarian peace movement. If other political forces in East Europe should be able to align a similar support, then maybe they might aim for more ambitious objectives.

A few months ago there was only a bare possibility of forming a new peace movement. At that time everybody knew everybody within it, and this was not difficult to do because of the slight interest in this matter. Despite all external difficulties, and despite all the problems of keeping communications, it seems to be fair to say that the new Hungarian peace movement has grown by leaps and bounds into a force which can confer with the state Peace Council on equal terms, which can organise meetings, where leading official and dissident personalities are present together, which can bring together different opinions and groups which in other circumstances would be wholly opposed to each other.

András Hegedús, who was a Prime Minister in the fifties, in one of his recent articles had dealt with this phenomenon at length.¹ (He classifies this new peace movement as 'a constructive force of opposition'; in some respects his analysis fails to make a definitive examination, but his interest is in itself significant.) Austrian and West German journalists are looking for the spokespersons of these new initiatives in order to get some hard information, and there is even a rumour in Hungary that Hungarian (naturally official) newspapers are contemplating publishing some commentary about it.

Yet nothing can be further from the truth or more danger-

ous for the peace groups than to say that everything is running well and that every dark cloud has passed. The new peace movement in Hungary remains on shaky grounds. For all the advantages of the present Hungarian political system in comparison with other socialist countries, there is no guarantee against aggressive intrusion on the part of the authorities. There are also efforts at provocation and some signs of intolerance. Notwithstanding all this, Peace is an invincible slogan and it is worth taking some risks, even by those who otherwise are little interested in political matters.

This sentiment was noticeable amongst those attending a meeting in a private apartment on 23 July 1982, where about 40 representatives of some of the new peace groups, as well as individuals, held a long workshop. Amongst them there were a variety of people, whose presence at the same meeting was of great significance. By the invitation of the organisers there were present: Eva Ancsel (a leading official marxist philosopher), Mr. András Hegedűs, Mr. Radnóti Sándor (a well-known dissident in Hungary) and a representative of the state Peace Council. Two members of the East-German 'Schwerter zu Pflugscharen' were also present, an event of great importance.

This was the first attempt to expound the aims and examine the problems of the new Hungarian peace movement, in reaching a broader public opinion in this country. The arrangement of this meeting was also eloquent testimony to the openness and straightforwardness of recent peace initiatives in Hungary. There is no secret organisation, there are no illegal activities: people can convince themselves about it by taking part, there is no condition for participation.

This is our fixed determination, and neither provocations nor persons of ill-will can deter us. Against charges that these new peace groups are consciously or unconsciously parts of the conspiracy of the rancorous imperialist bugbear it would be easy to bring counter-arguments. It is enough to refer to the early fifties, when persons were harshly condemned because they were allegedly agents of world imperialism or of Zionism. After some years they were rehabilitated as national heroes. Perhaps the comparison is excessive, but the analogy is valid.

There are several totally independent peace groups in Hungary, which are maintaining loose contacts with each other, and they lay particular stress on their autonomy. Recently initiatives were taken by them to form a broad platform which endorses the common objectives of these groups. However, no substantial progress was made in this respect. The main cause of this was that the participants did not wish to impose their particular aims and concepts on each other and they tried to continue to work without any tedious consensus. One of the participants at our workshop explained it in this way: 'The only safeguard of our lasting existence is the very diversity amongst us.'

The wide tolerance of disagreements among the representatives of various peace groups was assessed by some participants as a sign of weakness. They wanted some sort of governing body, which would decide every detail and would outline the main lines of common action. (There are interesting similarities with the problems of the Western peace movements as described by E.P. Thompson.²) But it would be a serious error to enforce such a universal platform; there are different approaches towards peace, and abstract generalisations might signal the beginning of political one-sidedness. The present flexible heads of agreement serve better as a platform. Sándor Radnóti has discussed this question, too: in his view, amongst intellectuals—in Hungary—there is a tendency to avoid responsibility for giving a definite programme even if they have one. This spiritual dubiety or uncertainty is due to past experiences, and is a logical consequence of present power relations. For nearly 40 years the intellectuals have learnt to hate every directive, every resolution, etc. At the same time this has had a negative effect upon their capacity to give concrete form to their own ideas and aspirations.

Reports about the activities of various groups

It was surprising and at the same time encouraging to hear about the different actions and activities carried out by these peace groups. The Anti-Nuclear Campaign (ANC) for instance has begun to distribute leaflets in the streets against nuclear weapons and they give out flowers with these leaflets. In one

of the so-called green areas of the city (Budapest) they have 'occupied' a park, which they have called 'ANC-park'. They hold their gatherings and meetings there. Their influence amongst youth is steadily growing and they now have a national network. They also seek to establish twinings in the West with students from secondary schools. (They can exchange badges, posters and other materials.)

It seems fair to say that this organisation is one of the most conspicuous peace groups in East Europe alongside the 'Schwerter zu Pflugscharen'. Even the official representative of the state Peace Council was ready to admit the spontaneity and the candid intentions of this group. 'One has to believe in their commitment'—as Eva Ancsel said.

As regards other representatives of this age-group, they are less organised. Amongst them there are some members of the Communist Youth Organisation (KISZ). Their political standpoint is strictly limited to the issue of Peace: at present they see no direct connections between the arms race, militarism and freedom. However, their point of view is highly respected by others and they are by no means only temporary fellows in this movement. Moreover, it was significant that in informal discussion they have mentioned an interesting fact: when they organised a peace march in early May of this year, the authorities forbade them to invite students from the universities. Their very attendance is evidence of their personal courage.

As for activities at the universities, it was interesting to talk with Eva Ancsel, the leading professor of the Marxist department of Budapest University, who last year sharply condemned the initiative for a peace march. She said at that time: the students from Budapest University in 23 October 1956 forfeited their honour for ever. (In '56 after their march there were serious clashes between insurgents and the security forces.) Now, at this meeting, she had changed her view: she expressed her distrust of the spontaneous character of these initiatives, but at the same time she admitted everybody's right to act for peace.

Eva Ancsel called the attention of the participants to the fact that the Soviet Union is a socialist country, while the United States of America is a capitalist one. She questioned

the motivations behind any peace movement which is not for the existing political balance: for her the preservation of the present *status quo* is pre-eminently necessary—if it must be with nuclear, then with nuclear weapons. 'Yalta is not a matter for debate'—she said, like the editorial of the Soviet weekly, *New Times*.³ Perhaps the very appearance of the new peace movement would destabilise the European order, and thus bring about the opposite of what it intends; instead of a lasting peace there will be a greater possibility of war, she continued.

Recently some young artists have formed an art-group, which has some interest in peace. This group, whose name is 'Indigo', is maintaining links both with the state Peace Council and with the new peace movement. Its representative spoke about their practical activities: their main concern is to transform military things into useful consumer goods. At the same time they offered their help in making posters, badges, etc.

After these reports there was a report on the Brussels Convention. This issue raised some questions in connection with the internal discussions in the European peace movement. The lecturer was in an embarrassing situation, because some of the participants confused END with the World Peace Council: in the Hungarian media END has a relatively good image and consequently the average Hungarian is a little bit suspicious of such organisations.

However, after some more precise information and after informing the workshop about the 'Appeal for a Nuclear-free Europe', the misinformations were cleared. For the participants it was refreshing to hear that in West Europe there is a resolute determination to build fruitful co-operation between East and West, as the 'Appeal' says: 'We appeal to our friends in Europe, of every faith and persuasion, to consider urgently the ways in which we can work together for these common objectives. We envisage a European-wide campaign, in which every kind of exchange takes place; in which representatives of different nations and opinions confer and co-ordinate their activities. . .'⁴

At the same time Sándor Radnóti voiced his disagreements with the Western peace movement. According to him this

immense movement is only the expression of the fear of nuclear war on the part of the Western *petty bourgeois*. This Western sort of *petty bourgeois* wants to isolate himself from the external world, for him it is a matter of indifference what happens in the far-away remoteness of East Europe: for instance, human rights in Czechoslovakia. 'Any disarmament movement is meaningful and hopeful only in the sense of the realisation of its objectives as a human rights movement',⁵—as V. Racek argued in his polemic with E.P. Thompson.

Mr. Radnóti increased the sharpness of Racek's criticism when he referred to an 'isolationist tendency' within the Western peace movement. Finally he concluded that 'for an Eastern peace movement it was of paramount importance to give a critique of the present Western peace movement'. In his opinion a really creative peace movement will grow primarily in East Europe. At the same time, he emphasised that Western newspapers overrate the significance of the 'Schwerter zu Pflugscharen'. He referred to his personal experience: he had been in Dresden, when this East German peace movement commenced its activity, and in his view the Western media overrated the whole matter. We have to work, not for publication in Western papers, but for internal results, he said.

As regards his opinion about the Western peace movement, it rests on misinformation. In Hungarian papers END generally is described as an organisation which follows a one-sided, pro-Soviet and sharply anti-American policy. From this obvious falsification even some prominent intellectuals have drawn defective conclusions. Besides, as the present situation proves, END has negligible contacts with East Europe, working channels are occasional, and this is a *terra incognita*. In the long run this weakness might prove fateful for the Western peace movement itself: the deep silence and ignorance in the East will justify the logic of the Western authorities: that the whole peace movement is playing into the Russians' hands. They can then make gigantic armament plans and have not the slightest disquiet about it.

It is true also that for the Western peace movement it is a delicate matter to take a harder line towards the Eastern

authorities. For two reasons: first, that East Europe is not a monolithic tomb, as it was in the fifties; every country has its own character. And the second reason is that even the official Peace Councils can serve as useful channels of communication. It would be foolish to ask the Western peace movement to break all contacts with state-funded peace organisations.

Perhaps in this respect the new Eastern peace movement has to take the first step, namely to sort out its problems with the official institutions. The new Hungarian peace groups have commenced to act in this spirit, although at this stage it would be premature to estimate the results. In the solution of this problem the Western peace movement cannot help and it would not be good if it were to intervene. For the Western peace movement there is 'only' one important task: they really 'must defend and extend the right of all citizens, East or West, to take part in this common movement and to engage in every kind of exchange'.⁶

Proposals and Projects

In addition to these reports and debates there were other issues on the agenda. The most controversial problem was of an organisational character: what options are open for the peace groups? To form a single broad movement with a co-ordinating body or council? To preserve the actual situation, namely to remain in small autonomous groups? Most of the groups opted for the second alternative, for political and identity reasons: they are very jealous about their independent status, they do not want to give it up even if this broader movement should be an autonomous one.

At the same time the representative agreed on two important projects: first, to form a *Peace Centre*, where there will be a club, a library and the headquarters of the peace groups; second to edit a *Peace Journal*. In connection with these projects there were many proposals: the practical tasks revived the strength of purpose of the participants, who were exhausted after the preceding discussions.

It was a great good fortune to learn of an opportunity to get appropriate premises for a *Peace Centre*. At the same

time, there were disagreements about the aims of the *Peace Journal*: will it be a theoretical or a political journal? What will be the conditions in connection with co-operation with the state Peace Council, which has a voice in granting a permission to publish such a journal in Hungary? At this point the representative of the Peace Council, who had remained silent, interrupted the debate and quite patriarchially said: 'It is very difficult to negotiate with you because not all of you are on the same platform, and there is no hope of forming a broad consensus.' This statement posed some questions about problems of future co-operation.

The representative of the Peace Council was in an awkward situation: he represented not only the Peace Council but also the interests of the Hungarian government (amongst them military interests) and above all the interests of the Soviet Union. From such a position it is hard to discuss with independent-minded people, for whom there is no other datum point but the *pure* desire for lasting peace. It was also embarrassing for the representative of the Peace Council to admit that they follow a schizophrenic policy towards peace: to welcome and to hate actions for peace, depending on where they come from, East or West.

But what is the difference between people either in East or in West, who want peace and who want to do something about it? Moreover, what are the criteria in the East which decide who may represent the cause of peace? Who has the right to judge which people may actively desire peace and which may not? Who can say that 'I am sure that you only dissemble aims of peace, when this is only a means for you to achieve other political objectives?' These questions were not answered by the representative of the state Peace Council. At the same time there were constructive elements in this sharp debate. There was a vague promise for help both with a *Peace Centre* and with the *Peace Journal*.

Finally the participants expressed their regret for non-attendance at the forthcoming Vienna Peace Festival. However, they cannot change the existing passport restrictions. It is tragic that Vienna is so near geographically to Budapest (only a few hours by train), but is so far away for political

reasons of the authorities. Such Festivals are very important for the creation of a united, independent Europe. However, both the attendance of East Europeans at these festivals and the notion of a united Europe seem at present to be utopian hopes.

Peace Group for Dialogue

In the present situation it is very important to find channels through which East and West can continue a reasonable dialogue. It will be hard work and 'the work would have to be done, at least in the first stages, *beneath* the level of states'.⁷ Spontaneous twinings and well-planned workshops for special themes are important.

There are many possible forms of these contacts. Let us take an example: the so-called 'Peace March '82' which was initiated by Scandinavian women did not fulfill this requirement. It was a mere puppet march for Soviet Propaganda. These Scandinavian marchers probably did not know how their march was being made use of, or else their status was the same as that of other marchers from the socialist countries, who were designated to march by the state Peace Councils and for whom the event (the relatively great luxury, travel, etc.) was a prize for their loyalty to one-sided policies which in other respects have many militarist aspects (see editorial comment below).

When I am talking about 'Peace Groups for Dialogue' I do really mean Dialogue: dialogues which are not sponsored by states but by voluntary decision. The states have other forums to establish useful contacts with each other. If state institutions are interested in matters which have no direct connection with them, in that case it is understandable to look for dissembled motives.

We, in East and West, have the means to establish contacts. We have to make every possible effort till this can be done. The threatening cloud of a new Cold War is now menacing us. At least in Europe there are many signs, which forebode this phenomenon. There is not much time. It is very important to set up a Peace Group for Dialogue. It has some symbolic significance that this initiative has been taken in the East, that is in Hungary. It is only a symbolic step, but its meaning is great.

NOTES

1. Hegedús András: 'Lehetséges-e konstruktív ellenzékiesség Kelet-Európában' (manuscript).
2. E.P. Thompson: *Zero Option*, The Merlin Press, London 1982, (Introduction).
3. *New Times*, 19th May, 1982.
4. 'Appeal for a Nuclear-free Europe', (END).
5. *Human Rights and Disarmament* (an exchange of letters between E.P. Thompson and Vaclav Racek), Spokesman, for END, Nottingham, 1981, p. 7.
6. 'Appeal for a Nuclear-free Europe', (END).
7. E.P. Thompson: 'Deterrence and Addiction', in *Zero Option*, p. 23.

*Editorial Comment—***The Scandinavian Women's March**

The Scandinavian Peacemarch was—and was only intended to be—from Stockholm to Minsk. The Soviet Peace Committee urged the marchers to continue to Vienna, by way of Bratislava and Budapest, but the Scandinavian marchers declined. In the event, nearly all the marchers returned home from Minsk, and only a small number (including some Finnish Communists) continued. But in Moscow the march was joined by new contingents from the Soviet Peace Committee, as well as supporters of the World Peace Council from other countries; substantial contingents from Eastern bloc nations, including Czechoslovakia, were later to join in. The 'luxury' referred to by Kőszegi was a feature not of the earlier (Stockholm–Helsinki) but of the later stages of the march.

This (essentially new) march, calling itself 'Peacemarch '82', presented itself as a continuation of the Scandinavian march and was given massive and favourable media treatment in the East. This explains Ferenc Kőszegi's sharp comments. It is also the background to the action of two 'oppositional' supporters of peace and of human rights, who handed out leaflets to the marchers as they passed through Budapest city centre on August 4th.

TO THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE PEACE MARCH 82

You have been invited here to testify to the peace-loving nature of the policies of the Hungarian Government. But you should know that many Hungarians are dissatisfied with their country's efforts in the cause of peace. At the same time they have not right to express their dissatisfaction.

In 1968 our Government took part in the armed occupation of Czechoslovakia, and today it supports the military dictatorship in Poland. At any one time, more than a hundred young Hungarians are serving heavy prison sentences for trying to exercise their constitutionally guaranteed freedom of conscience by refusing military service—and the law provides no possibility for any civil, social alternative to military service. Military expenditure is a state secret—and the press can't criticise the armed forces. A hundred thousand foreign soldiers are stationed in Hungary, and our Government doesn't even ask to become a full partner in the Central European talks to reduce armed forces. Our neighbours are friendly countries, yet Soviet rockets designed for attack are deployed here. In this way Hungary is made into a possible target for nuclear warfare. But none of this can be debated in public.

We appeal to you not to assist in the misusing of the cause of peace. And we ask you to remember that there can be no peace without freedom.

László Rajk
architect
Budapest, 4th August 1982.

Miklós Haraszti
writer

Miklós Haraszti, the writer, and author of *A Worker in a Worker's State* (Penguin, 1977) first became prominent when he organised unofficial protests against the American war in Vietnam. László Rajk, architect, is the son of the Communist leader of the same name who was executed after a framed-up show trial (as an 'Anglo-American imperialist agent') in the Stalinist purge of 1949.

The police contented themselves with taking down Haraszti's and Rajk's names. We have heard of no further actions taken against them.

The best account in English of the Stockholm-Minsk (i.e. genuine) Peacemarch is by Jean Stead, the Assistant Editor of the *Guardian*, who accompanied the marchers. Her reports in the paper were concluded by a major article (13 August 1982) setting down her conclusions: these are republished in END pamphlet 'Moscow Independent Peace Group'.

THE 'NORMALISATION' OF EUROPE

A Lecture delivered in a private apartment in Budapest,
23 September 1982.

Friends and colleagues,

It is an honour to meet you today and to discuss our common problems. I had hoped to be able to give this lecture on the premises of the university or in some public place. But in the event this has not proved to be possible. I am a stranger to your country and to its forms and proprieties, and I am not clear as to the reasons why the proposed arrangement proved to be difficult. I trust that I have not given offence to any institution. That has not been my intention. I have met with courtesy on every side. It has even been suggested to me that I might give the lecture, in some form, on the premises of the National Peace Council before an invited audience. I would have had no difficulty with this if I had also been able to give the same lecture in a more public place under the auspices of the independent peace movement who are my hosts in Budapest. I was unable to accept the offer of the Hungarian Peace Council, without this condition, but I wish again to thank the officers of the Council for the courtesy they have shown me and for their helpful and interesting exchanges of views. The reasons why I have proved to be so awkward and uncommodating will become plain in my lecture. But, in brief, I am pledged to my section of the Western peace movement to a strict and non-aligned code of conduct: and to present my views in the East only if they can be as fully and openly presented here as in the West. We have to act as citizens of a healed continent. We have to act as if the Cold War is already at an end.

It is a responsibility to be here. There is an artificial ideological chasm across our continent, and voices cannot

* A Lecture delivered in a private apartment in Budapest, 23 September 1982.

always be heard across it. I will meet this responsibility in the only way proper. I ask your permission to speak with complete frankness. I will not waste your time on platitudes. It is probable that we will have a nuclear war, which will utterly devastate your country and mine, in the next twenty years. This war will bring to an end European civilisation.

Yet expressions of horror or goodwill alone will not prevent this outcome. Goodwill may even be a mask behind which other motives and other interests are at work. We must identify these motives and interests. And we must do so, not as partisans of one 'side' or the other 'side': we must do so together. And then we must find ways of acting together. First of all we must take off our masks. We must be ready for difficult, uncomfortable arguments. As Gulya Illyes wrote in his 'Ode to Bartok':

Let there be harmony!
Order, but true order, lest the world perish
O, if the world is not to perish
the people must be free
to speak, majestically!¹

I must first explain briefly my personal position. I am not an absolute pacifist. There are circumstances in which I think it to be right to take arms in self-defence.

But on nuclear weapons I am an absolutist. A civilisation which rests upon the constant daily threat of mutual extermination is a barbarism. We, in the majority tradition of the Western peace movement, do not just refuse particular weapons—the cruise missile, MX and Trident, the SS20. We refuse them all. And we ask for this refusal on both sides. There are not good democratic Western bombs and evil communist ones: or good proletarian bombs and evil Western imperialist ones. What is the purpose of discussing the 'balance' or 'parity' of two absolute evils?

Nor does talk of 'balance' make for any kind of military sense. For nuclear weapons are not weapons of defence. They are weapons of menace or threat: and, in the same moment, of suicide. A nuclear 'deterrent' is like a pistol which, in the very same moment that it is pointed at an

antagonist, is also pointed at one's own head. It is to say, 'Don't move, or we will blow us both up!' That is not a credible defence, even though it is what may in the end happen. Meanwhile this fearful threat has rather little effect on the actual behaviour of armed states.

There is a second personal point. I happen to distrust all armed states, for reasons which go beyond the matter of weaponry itself. William Blake wrote, when the French Revolution had passed into its Napoleonic imperial era—

The strongest poison ever known
Came from Caesar's laurel crown.

This poison does not come only in the form of plutonium. It is generally true in history that—except in moments of aroused national self-defence—a state of war, or of high military preparedness, is also a degenerative condition in the political and social life of a nation. A military definition of reality is superimposed upon all other human intentions and needs and rights. Certainly—but here I can speak only from Western experience—the long-protracted state of Cold War has encouraged diseases in the body politic—priority given to arms industries over services (education, health, welfare), the strengthening of security services and police, the imposition of ideological conformity and stupidity, 'official secrecy'—which in Britain means keeping secret from the British people facts which are perfectly well-known to the intelligence services of the Warsaw Treaty powers—and all the rest. I used to jest at our own peace meetings that the only growth area of the British economy today is telephone-tapping. Now we have had the Falklands War, and the growth area is building replacements for sunken battle-ships.

If the present Cold War—or adversary posture of the two blocs—is protracted for a further 20 years, it will not inevitably lead to the final holocaust, although it will probably do so: but it will, very certainly, give rise to two profoundly distorted economies and damaged cultures—to two opposed warlike societies, ruled by leaders who are intolerant security-minded persons: and hence to a diminution of every citizen's

freedom and right as against the demands of the rival armed states.

That is a dismal outlook. But we must be plain about it. We must not avert our eyes. It gives to this moment of rising peace consciousness, in East and West, a special urgency: this opportunity may be our last before the trap finally closes upon us. Forgive me if I cause offence. I am not talking about the *intentions* of leaders, on your side or on mine. To predict the course of history from the intentions of individual leaders is futile. I am indicating a deep process, quite beyond the intentions of individuals, by which the overfat military establishments of one side continually feed and further fatten the other.

A strange propaganda duel took place in the world's forum in the past year. Caspar Weinberger, the US Secretary for Defense, issued with an immense sound of tin trumpets, a book prepared in the Pentagon entitled *Soviet Military Power*. This showed a fearsome growth in recent years of Soviet forces—tanks, missiles, aircraft, naval power. The size and technical proficiency of Soviet and Warsaw Pact military resources were shown with graphs, diagrams and alarming pictures, to be without precedent.

This goulash was not all made up of lies, although there were some ugly lies within it. What it neglected to do was present any means of comparison: that is, any comparable information on US and NATO military power. This was at once repaired by the Military Publishing House of the USSR Ministry of Defence which issued its own glossy illustrated handbook, *Whence the Threat to Peace?* If anything, the pictures in this one were better—since they are more easy to obtain from Western than from Soviet sources—and they were more alarming. They showed a fearsome build-up in recent years of United States and NATO forces.

At the time of the French Revolution the leading exponent in England of *The Rights of Man* was Thomas Paine, and the leading critic was Edmund Burke, author of *Reflections on the French Revolution*. One philosophical British reformer sent both books to be bound together as one: he said that, when read together, they made up a very good book. In the same way, *Soviet Military Power* and *Whence the Threat*

to Peace? should be bound in a common volume. But they do not make a very good book. They make together a book so fearsome that the mind and the emotions recoil before it. It is the most barbaric catalogue of the ingenuity of the instruments of murder ever known in the human record. It is an inventory of twin matched evils, a balance-sheet in which every item is loss. This book is a confession of absolute human failure.

But the general shape of the facts is true. I mention this in case there should be anyone here who reads the newspapers upside-down. And the facts of Western military build-up are true not only of the USA. Let me cite the case of my own country. In 1982, a year in which the productive sectors of the British economy have been experiencing great difficulties, in which money for education and services has been cut, in which there are over three millions unemployed, Mrs Thatcher's government has been able to fight an expensive war in the South Atlantic and has also agreed to replace the ageing group of Polaris missile submarines with the most expensive of all options possible, the American-designed Trident D5. The British Ministry of Defence reported proudly last week that the quantity of multiple independently-targeted warheads on the Trident missiles is such that Britain will have 672 warheads to deliver on targets in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union instead of the 96 in the present Polaris fleet. The new missiles will have a range of 6,000 miles as compared with 2,800 miles for Polaris. And each additional mile will bring 15,000 new square miles into the target area. Britain will therefore be able to target about seven times as many cities and bases as before. And by what analysis have Mrs Thatcher and her military advisors decided that, in fifteen years time, it will be necessary for my country to have forces of extermination seven times more hideous and more menacing? It would seem to me to be a pessimistic deduction. It might even be thought to be unneighbourly. Meanwhile, these Tridents will cost Britain's ailing economy some ten thousand million pounds: and this, with the additions for rebuilding sunken battleships, telephone-tapping and the rest, will perhaps destroy my country without any need for Soviet intervention.

I cannot cite with equal accuracy details from the other side of the chasm since matters are not so openly published in the Soviet Union. But we have it on the best authority that, if the growth of weaponry in NATO in the past 20 years has been fearsome, it has been fearsome in the Warsaw Pact also. For President Brezhnev has on several occasions spoken of 'rough parity' in the opposed nuclear weapons systems. If one side is hideous, and the other side is in 'rough parity', then it must follow that the other side is hideous also. There is a reciprocal, mutually-accelerating state of ferocity. The weapons-systems are now the leading sectors of the economy on both sides of the world, and in their interactive stimulation, and in the priority awarded to military needs over all other needs, we may begin, as Zdenek Mlynar has suggested, to discern a 'new mode' of development'.

It is against this mode, which is developing a universal death, and which is enforcing—in the increasing sale of arms by both WTO and NATO powers to the Third World—its own diseased forms upon the poorer nations of the 'South', that the peace movement has risen—and continues to rise—in the West. It has been epidemic in character, moving swiftly across frontiers like a benign infection: now Holland, now Britain: next Scandinavia, Germany, Italy: and then across the Atlantic. It commenced as a refusal: as Erhard Eppler declared, 'the chain of armaments must be cut through'. But it is more than a refusal. There is, I have been told, some misunderstanding over on this side as to the position of the Western peace movement: or, I should say, that part of the Western peace movement to which I belong. I think I may say that this position is becoming the majority tendency in West Europe and the USA, although there are other minority positions: for example, absolute pacifism, or in some countries pro-Soviet sympathisers. The position which I will explain to you is very widely held in the British Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, which is an association of the mass peace movement in Britain: I have found it widely supported in Ireland, in Iceland, and in Norway. It has been elaborated by the experienced Inter-church Peace Council (IKV) in Holland: by an influential section of the

movement in Austria: it is strongly present, for example among the Greens, in the debates now going on in West Germany: and similar arguments are found in Southern Europe, especially in the eurocommunist Italian Communist Party and independent ecological, feminist, and left groups.

First, our position on nuclear weapons is absolutist. We refuse them. The human species, the planet itself, cannot afford them. It is essential to the morale of our movement that we should not compromise this refusal by behaving like politicians and arguing about 'numbers'. Now, in many parts of West and South Europe, from Stornoway in the Western Isles of Scotland to Comiso in Sicily, many people are preparing for peaceful direct action: sit-downs, peace camps outside bases, blockades, hunger strikes. I ask you to give your solidarity to these people!

How is this to be done? I do not know your circumstances. I do not wish to intervene in your proper national affairs. But if the destruction of our continent is at stake, then we must consult together and act as Europeans: we must discard narrow national or ideological views. You must know, if you reflect, that this is so, and even for very practical political reasons. The Western peace movement is strong but it is not yet strong enough to impose its will upon states or military organisations. And it is now reaching the limits of certain ideological/political barriers. What is the question that we are asked most frequently by hostile critics in our countries? 'We agree that disarmament is good', these critics say, 'but where is the peace movement on the other side?' And if it is answered that the Soviet Peace Committee, and certain other national peace committees and councils in the East have organised their own demonstrations and petitions, the critic replies: 'Yes, but these were directed against NATO weapons, not against the weapons and militarism of their own states.' I was present at the great demonstration in Bonn last October which saw the West German movement come to maturity. All afternoon a hostile plane circled overhead drawing behind it a streamer inscribed 'Wer demonstriert in Moskau?' (Who is demonstrating in Moscow?). If the Western peace movement is to break through this barrier, then we must be able to clasp hands with a non-

aligned movement, totally independent of the state, on your side also. What has been epidemic must become pandemic.

Yet our own position remains absolutist. Whether an independent movement gains strength on your side or not, we will maintain our absolute refusal. This is unconditional. We are not politicians engaged in clever trading negotiations. Our stand is misinterpreted, not only by hostile critics in the West, but also by some observers in the East. They suppose our stand to be motivated by fear or defeatism—or perhaps by pro-Soviet and anti-American emotions: perhaps the response to Soviet military and diplomatic pressure of a nervous Western intelligentsia and ‘petty bourgeoisie’?

No! Of course there may be such minority elements, here and there. But the majority position is grounded not only upon an absolute moral premise. It is also grounded in political logic. Our logic remains one of negotiation: but negotiation *by action*, in which the nations of Europe, East and West, resume an autonomous role. For twenty years the superpowers have imposed their hegemony upon other European nations—have taken all negotiations into their own hands: and all the time the weaponry has gone up and up. Today, once again, negotiations are proceeding behind closed doors at Geneva, on a matter which could scarcely concern all Europeans more—intermediate European ‘theatre’ weapons, the instruments of a ‘limited nuclear war’—and yet there are no European seats at the negotiating table. To refuse these weapons any place on our territory—to refuse any forward launching or air bases from which these weapons might be deployed—is the only option for autonomy left to your people or to mine: the autonomy of survival.

But I spoke of ‘negotiating by action’. CND in Britain, like the Dutch peace movement, support unilateral measures of disarmament. If Holland or Britain refuse any weapons system—and the Dutch and British Labour Parties are pledged to do so—it is not supposed that the matter will end there. It will be the first step in a process of direct negotiation. We hope to come back then, as better neighbours, to your side—perhaps to the Soviet Union, perhaps to Hungary or Poland—and say: ‘We have stopped that system and removed these

bases of the United States military from our territory. Now, then, which system will you stop in exchange, which bases of the Soviet forces will you (politely of course) remove?’

We are tired of leaving our fate in the hands of the politicians of the superpowers, most of whom are locked into the inertia of the *status quo*. Nor would our actions endanger in any way our own nation’s legitimate defence. I have already explained that these are not defensive weapons: and that bases can only invite attack. But there is another point. These systems are grossly in excess of any military ‘needs’ in even the maddest of strategic scenarios. This is not just the view of some utopian ‘pacifist’. It is the clear judgement of senior military men and arms advisors from both sides, although they tell us this only when they have retired and are free to speak. There is a long list of such expert witnesses. A recent one is Field Marshal Lord Carver, the retired chief of the British military staff, who published three weeks ago a book called *A Policy for Peace*. Lord Carver says clearly that ‘the number and variety of weapons systems of the USA and USSR is grossly in excess of what is needed’ for deterrence, and additional systems are ‘superfluous.’

Both sides are as fat with weapons systems as a goose being prepared for Christmas dinner. Sir Martin Ryle, the British astronomer royal, has said that there is already enough nuclear weaponry on our continent to destroy Europe totally more than 20 times. How can it matter whether one side can do this 11 times and the other only 9 times? Once is enough. So that even on the premises of military ‘deterrence’ there is fat enough to be cut out without any risk.

This is only the first part of our logic. The second part can only be confirmed, or rejected, by you on this side. Your generosity in inviting me to speak openly here tonight, perhaps even in the face of the disapproval of some misinformed persons in influential places, moves me very deeply. We also, in our movement in the West, organise, argue and act in the face of official disapproval and misunderstanding: and despite the many, and real, and important, freedoms of press and opinion in my own country, we often have

difficulty in gaining expression for any full statement of our views in the most popular television or newspaper media. But your generosity here tonight makes me have confidence that the logic of our position may be correct. We believe that if we continue to act—even if unilaterally—in this way: and that if we can force one or more Western governments to take these actions of unilateral refusal: then we will meet, over on this side, with an equivalent response, equivalent popular pressure, and action.

I will go further. To suppose that the majority Western peace movement is motivated by fear or by pro-Soviet ideological premises is a very great mistake. It could be a tragic mistake. It could prevent us from gaining the response, from your side, which is urgent and essential to complete the logic of the movement for peace and against the armed states of the world. Soviet leaders must come to understand that there are now millions in the West whose beliefs and ideas they would describe as 'anti-Soviet'—that is, who are severe critics of aspects of Soviet actuality, who are supporters of intellectual and civil rights, who support as a matter of principle the rights of conscientious objection from military service, or who are—as the majority trade union and Labour movements of the West are—sympathisers with Solidarnosc and the Polish renewal—there are millions of such people, who also support the peace movement, precisely because they believe that a condition of militarism, a state of preparedness for war, brings out the worst features of both opposed social and political systems.

Good friends, these people wish to talk with you! How much they wish to talk, to show goodwill, to defy the absurd legacies of an old, bad and dead history, to defy the antique security and ideological barriers on both sides which hold us apart! But they wish to talk with you directly as I am privileged to talk with you now. They do not wish to talk with you in *any* way and on *any* terms. They wish to talk with you as human neighbours, on an endangered continent, and yet not in such a way as to give advantage or propaganda points to either military bloc. They wish to talk with you honestly and directly, *beneath* the level of the armed states and their ideological caretakers.

This is the reason why many parts of the Western peace movement, including END—the committee for European Nuclear Disarmament of which I am a member—have been shy of direct linkages with national peace councils and committees on your side. To be plain: we do not like the World Peace Council, and we are wary of its affiliated organisations. The WPC has endorsed some good causes in the past, but it has always or very often acted one-sidedly, as a partisan and sometimes as a captive of Soviet diplomatic interests. It appears to us sometimes as Soviet state interests, wearing the mask of peace and goodwill. We do not suppose the interests of the Soviet state to be inherently aggressive or expansionist, although there have been occasions when—for 'reasons of state' or national 'defence'—aggressions and expansions have taken place. But we cannot accept a situation in which we are contesting, with all our energy and in every moment of our work, the military policies and ideologies of our own states: but we are told that the only permissible channel for communication with fellow workers for peace on your side must be committees or councils which in most respects *support* the military policies and ideologies of their own states. That is a bad, unequal, even deceptive relationship between movements and peoples.

Of course, if one side was wholly blameworthy and the other side wholly innocent, there might be some reason in this. But no-one—and certainly no-one of influence in the majority Western peace movement—believes that sort of fairy-tale any more. What are we to make of a 'Peace Committee' which, in the past few weeks, apologised for the harassment of a small independent group of peace workers in Moscow, and did not protest when their leader, Sergei Batovrin, was forcibly sent to a mental hospital and administered depressant drugs? That has become, in the British and American peace movements, an occasion for scandal. The hooligans who acted in this way against this small group are as dangerous to our work for peace as are the manufacturers of nuclear arms.

I am not here criticising the Hungarian Peace Council. This Council has been present, as an observer, at several of our conferences in the West: its representatives have made

constructive contributions and have attended to criticisms of WTO military policies with courtesy. We are glad to acknowledge their more tolerant and flexible approach. But I wish to explain why it is that—whenever the question of co-operation with organisations on your side comes up, our supporters always ask us at once: 'Is that movement truly independent and non-aligned? Has it criticised the weapons and strategies of its own bloc as well as those of the West?'

At the same time, and all the time, our own supporters do wish to talk with you, so long as the talk is honest, the communication is free and open, and not only what is permitted to be poured through some official funnel into the correct official bottles. I will give you an example. Last Saturday, less than a week ago, I was speaking at a meeting of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament at Blaenau Ffestiniog, a small town in North Wales. There were some 500 persons at the meeting and many more hundreds of young people at a festival of music and theatre outside. The population of this town is only some 6,000 people, but many had come from the nearby region. The speakers included the MP for the region, the President of the Welsh National Party, the deputy Archdruid—a leader of Welsh national culture—a Catholic priest, and a member of the Scandinavian Womens Peacemarch who had also visited Mr Batovrin's independent group while in Moscow.²

I must explain one further matter. On 23 February 1982 the whole of Wales was proclaimed a 'nuclear free zone'. This was the culmination of a year-long campaign, in which many thousands took part, and in which by democratic votes and after much discussion every major city and every county council in Wales voted to be nuclear free. This means that they refused to have nuclear weapons based on their territory, manufactured within it, and refused also to take part in useless 'cosmetic' gestures at civil defence since reputable authorities agree that there is no defence for populations against these weapons. When the final county in Wales—Clwyd—passed this resolution, there was issued a Clwyd Declaration on behalf of the whole country of Wales:

. . . the whole of Wales, through its democratically elected repre-

sentatives, has declared itself a nuclear free zone. By this action Wales has given a moral lead to the other countries of Europe and the world.

In passing on to them our message of hope and inspiration, we call upon the other nations of Europe to make known their deep concern for the culture of civilisation. We call upon them to commit themselves to the cause of redeeming Europe from total destruction by taking the initial step of declaring their homelands nuclear free zones.

When I told the meeting that I was coming to Budapest, I was asked to take this message with me. But matters went further. I told them that I had heard that there was a rising spirit of peace-consciousness in your country and new movements taking their own independent positions, willing to act impartially in order to restrain the militarism not only of the West but also of your own side. And it was decided then to place a message in the hall for those present to sign.³

This message comes to you with the warmest feelings, with the greatest goodwill to all people committed to peace activity in Hungary. I was asked to pass it on to the new Peace Centre which you will form in Budapest.

And this is the most important thing I wish to say about the new peace movement, West or East. They are movements which may have commenced in fear, but they are now movements of hope. They are not only contesting particular missiles—cruise and SS20. They are engaged also in the recreation of internationalism, by hundreds of different exchanges between peace activists. They are moving forward from missiles to contesting the bloc system itself, from whose antagonism the rival militarisms arise. They are setting themselves an astonishing objective: to break down, not in some distant future which may never arrive, but in the next ten years the Cold War itself. The practical objective must now be the dissolution of both blocs, with intermediate measures for regional nuclear free zones—the Balkans, the Baltic, Central Europe—linked to the progressive demilitarisation, with the withdrawal of contentional forces also, of the whole continent: that is, the 'normalisation' of Europe.

Friends, our situation today is not only perilous. It is

abnormal and absurd. Here we are, a few hours away from each other by train or car or plane. We share many elements of common history and culture. There is no geological chasm which keeps us apart. The people—and the young people of both sides especially—share common interests, styles of dress, tastes in music, concern for the environment and for the Third World. What keeps us apart is not a line on the ground but a line inside our heads. Or it is the weight of old and bad history, which ‘weighs like an alp upon the living’. This unnatural state is the legacy of a particular moment, a particular balance of forces, at the end of World War II, which has protracted its moment long after the reasons for that moment have passed away. A new generation has arisen on both sides, in Bonn or in Budapest, for whom this artificial segregation—this *apartheid* imposed by senile ideologies—is an obscenity.

In every moment that we accept the false divisions of the Cold War in our heads we are guilty of treason to each other. We allow the armed states—from the inertia of the past—to arrange us according to military, and not according to human, definitions of reality. We allow the senescent ideologies to say that anyone acting for disarmament by direct unilateral action in the West is somehow ‘pro-Soviet’, a conscious or unconscious agent of communist power. And we allow them to say that anyone in the East who is critical of your own militarism or who demands certain rights of free communication or expression is a conscious or unconscious agent of Western imperialism. In this way we are held apart from each other, and our strength is bent against each other. The abnormalities of our split civilisation are legitimated and extended into the future, in which this state of fission will destroy us all.

But if only we could find some way of bending our strengths together—some force of cultural and political fusion—with difficulties and with risks we could enforce our will upon both armed blocs. How could this be done? This is what the Western peace movement wishes to talk with you about—to consult and take your advice. We are clear only on a few matters. First, the Cold War can never be ended by the victory of one side over the other side:

there can be no such victory without war. It can be ended only as a result of a ‘people’s détente’—a détente beneath the level of states—created by popular initiative, above all by the young. Second, no peace movement has any chance of success which serves the interests of only one side: the peace movement must be resolutely non-aligned. Third, it is no part of the peace movement’s work to intervene in the complicated questions of the national political life on the other side. The Western peace movement ought not to intervene in your affairs—although, since we are an undisciplined movement of ‘individualists’ I cannot promise that no-one will try to do so. And independent peace movements in the East do not exist to create little moments of drama in the Western press, nor even to give legitimacy to the independent peace movement of the West, but to work steadily for peace according to national conditions and needs, offering their own proposals, and with the single objective of the success of our common work.

I have said, in other places, that the Western peace movement and the forces making for democratisation in the East are natural allies: that the causes of peace and of freedom go together. I believe that this is true, in a profound historical way: here is the force which will combine our strengths. Let us say that the movements should ‘recognise’ each other. But the Western peace movement is not in the business of being an export agency, seeking to export into the East, along with the ideas of peace, a whole set of other ideas and demands, some of which may be appropriate to your national conditions and some of which may not. And I hope that peace movements on your side will show a similar self-restraint. I will go further. I think the peace movements—our joint peace movements together—should exert their influence as a stabilising force, not as a force making for dramas and emergencies. We may wish to ‘de-stabilise’ the military structures of both sides, but this does not mean that we wish to throw political life into a turmoil.

I will give you a sensitive example. If the Polish renewal should advance once more and if martial law could be lifted, this would be welcomed by the Western peace movement. We are, after all, most of us trade unionists ourselves: and

the British trade union movement has just had its own day of Solidarity with our health workers, on September 22nd. But if the Polish renewal should afford to the Polish nation more space for autonomy then it should be the business of the Western peace movement to use all its strength to hold back those militarist elements in the USA or NATO who might wish to press into these spaces and secure some advantage for NATO from what they might perceive as a 'weakness' in the WTO. This is an example of what I mean by a 'stabilising force'. The proper response of the Western peace movement to the Polish situation ought to be to enforce a relaxation of military tension in Central Europe, to enable there to be space for the Polish people to work out their problems internally and with their neighbours without interference. How can Pershing II missiles, sited on the rim of West Germany, bring freedom or renewal to anyone?

I will be frank. The Western peace movement is not strong enough yet to give any guarantees that it can restrain NATO adventurers. We are in our childhood still. We must grow stronger. But we have reached a point when we can only gain this strength if we are part of a transcontinental movement, a non-aligned movement stretching across the whole of Europe. And I will not disguise my own advice as to a proper and normal objective. It is time, after 37 years, that World War II was concluded with a normal peace treaty in the Germanies. And this would bring about, as no kind of provocation but as a normal event, the entire withdrawal of foreign military presence and bases, first from Central Europe (including West Germany), and next from our continent: to be specific, forces and bases from the West. We should invite this withdrawal with courtesy: we should thank these forces for their acts of liberation, we should say goodbye with flowers. But thirty-seven years is a long time. It is long enough.

Excuse one anecdote. I was engaged in a radio programme on a United States network, when I was interviewed by President Carter's former press secretary, Jody Powell. He enquired as to the reasons for our movement's refusal of cruise missiles which the USA was so generous as to be

sending for our protection. At a certain point he became indignant at my replies: I had had the ill manners to remind him that the American people had themselves once issued a Declaration of Independence. And he warned me that if Europeans were so truculent, then the American people might take offence and become isolationist once more and withdraw all their forces from Europe. I replied, with great courtesy, that this was very good thinking on the part of the American people, that the American military presence in Europe was a heavy charge on their taxes, and that while Americans were very welcome in my country as tourists or in any civil capacity, many of us would be happy to see their forces go home. Mr Powell exploded at me with a story attributed to the moment when General de Gaulle decided to break with NATO military arrangements, and invited the United States Ambassador to his presence, with a request that by a certain date all American forces should be withdrawn from France. According to this story, the Ambassador received this message impassively, and then withdrew: but at the door he turned and said: 'I understand, General. But there is one thing I must tell my President. Are we also to remove all the graves of American servicemen killed in the liberation of France?'

Mr Jody Powell supposed that he had knocked me flat on the ground, without any possible reply. But then, as is the custom on American radio, there was a commercial break to advertise deodorants, cookies and Kleenex tissues, with little bits of pop music, and I had time to think of an answer. When he came back on the air I told him that, however generous the act of liberation had been, it did not bring with it the right to perpetual occupation. And that, as it happened, I had myself taken part in the war of liberation in Italy and that there were many graves of my own comrades left behind in Italian soil. But that I did not for that reason wish to occupy Italy today. I preferred to live in Worcester in England. I might have added, but I did not, that my brother has a grave, alongside partisans' graves, in Bulgaria. But that I did not suppose that for this reason Bulgaria today should be under British occupation.

Of course the foreign forces in Europe today are not

forces of occupation. But they are still the testimony to an abnormal and unresolved state of affairs, and a heavy burden upon the resources of both superpowers. It is in the direct interests of both that this situation should now be ended, and it is our business—the business of a transcontinental peace movement—to provide the conditions in which with the least possible risk, or advantage to one side against the other, this can be done.


To conclude. I hope that I have not exceeded the limits of your courtesy or intervened with provocative questions. There is only one kind of intervention which I could never make apology for: I, and any other member of the transcontinental peace movement, East or West, have a plain duty to support the initiatives of fellow workers for peace in any part of Europe, if they should meet with any kind of difficulties or interference. I—and END and CND—are vigorously supporting members of the Turkish Peace Association now on trial in Ankara: and we have supported Mr Sergie Batovrin and the small independent peace group recently formed in Moscow against the harassment of security-minded authorities. We insist that we cannot succeed—that our common future is put in peril—if there is not the most open communication of ideas between those who work for peace, East and West: and we insist upon defending the right of independent groups to meet, to publish, to organise, to discuss and to act, in any part of the continent, whether the authorities favour them or not.

We cannot succeed unless there arise in Europe a new kind of 'peace people' whose allegiance is to the repair of our continent: who refuse to acknowledge the Cold War in their hearts or their heads: who aid each other: who refuse to acknowledge prohibitions of security or ideology: who act already today as free citizens of the continent in peace, a new Europe which renounces all recourse to the weapons of barbarism, and which permits controversy about social systems and ideologies to be contested only by normal political and cultural means. It is because I find the same vision of a transcontinental movement in the minds of the new 'Peace Group for Dialogue' that it is a privilege to speak here today. Friends, you are already a sign of the

special peace people, the free citizens of Europe's future. I express my thanks to our hosts, my real humility before you. May we, together, succeed!

NOTES

1. Gyula Illyes, 'Ode to Bartok', *New Reasoner*, no. 5. Summer 1958.
2. The speakers at the Blaenau Ffestiniog CND Festival for Peace included Dafydd Elis Thomas, M.P., Dr. Gwynfor Evans, Dr. Geraint Bowen, Father Owen Hardwicke and Ms Danielle R. Grünberg.
3. The message, inscribed in Welsh and English, read: 'At a public meeting of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament in Blaenau Ffestiniog in nuclear-free Wales, we, the undersigned, resolved to send this message of friendship and greetings to our fellow workers for peace in Budapest at the new Peace Centre. May all Europe be reunited in peace! By our common efforts we will bring the cold war to an end!' No count was made of the final number of signatories which was several hundreds. The meeting also sent a beautiful slate ornament to the Peace Centre (which may open shortly) and some Welsh daffodil bulbs to the anti-nuclear movement in the Hungarian schools.



Cover of the 'samizdat' Hungarian translation of
E.P. Thompson's pamphlet 'Beyond the Cold War'

What is END?

END means European Nuclear Disarmament. It works together with CND and other grass-roots campaigning groups in Europe, both East and West, toward a single objective. . . a nuclear free Europe.

The campaign works for disarmament both through unilateral initiatives and international co-operation. Its supporters work for nuclear-free zones in towns, regions and nations. And to unite people striving for disarmament, peace groups, and nuclear free zone groups twinning with like-minded campaigns in Europe and America.

The eventual aim is a treaty banning all so-called European theatre weapons (including those in Western Russia and on American submarines), together with a guarantee not to use nuclear weapons against any part of the political territory of Europe.

Since its beginning, support for the idea of END and nuclear disarmament throughout Europe has been growing rapidly. In the last few years, millions of people have taken to the streets of major cities throughout the world to show their concerted opposition to the plans to deploy cruise and Pershing II missiles and the neutron bomb in Western Europe and the build-up of SS20s in Eastern Europe.

Underneath this massive protest is a structure of European support for peace initiatives that is making its weight felt in both the Pentagon and the Kremlin.

Nuclear disarmament groups have formed in most western European countries, each growing as it sees fit each in contact with similar groups in other countries. We are now receiving news of the exciting spread of independent peace groups in eastern Europe. All this together with the amazing growth of the peace movement in the US, Japan and the Pacific, means we are part of the biggest mass movement in modern history.

In appealing to fellow Europeans, we are not turning our backs on the world. In working for the peace of Europe we are working for the peace of the world. Twice in this century Europe has disgraced its claims to civilisation by engendering world war. This time we must repay our debts to the world by engendering peace.

Joint END/Merlin pamphlets

The new Hungarian peace movement

One of the main movers of the new autonomous Hungarian peace movement, Ferenc Kőszegi, outlines the fascinating growth of cells of peace activists in schools and universities. With an introduction by E.P. Thompson, this exciting publication describes in detail the ideas behind this important phenomenon and its struggle to avoid co-option by the state, official peace council and dissidents, and remain a mass movement. Also included is E.P. Thompson's lecture given in Budapest on 'The normalisation of Europe'.

ISBN 0850362946 price: 90p

Moscow independent peace group

Since the news hit the western press that a peace group independent of the official peace committee had been formed, END has received many inquiries for more information on that group. We now have first hand accounts from Jean Stead (Assistant Editor of *The Guardian*) and END supporter Danielle Grünberg who were on the Scandinavian women's march and visited the group while passing through Moscow. The pamphlet also presents additional documents and invites debate from the peace movement.

ISBN 0850362954 price: 75p

Comiso

As part of the militarisation of NATO's southern flank, the small Sicilian town of Comiso is threatened with a cruise missile base in December '83. But over half the adult population of Sicily have pledged themselves against it and the island is now the focus for the European peace movement. Ben Thompson examines the background of Italian politics and gives a first-hand account of the Sicilian struggle.

ISBN 0850362962 price: 60p

Turkey

Jailing the leaders of Turkey's peace movement is just part of the military regime's campaign to suppress all opposition. Representatives of END have been to Turkey to monitor the drawn-out trial of the peace association, who are receiving support from peace groups all over Europe. In this pamphlet Mehmet Ali Dikerdem and John Mepham look at the history and work of the Turkish Peace Association and analyse why a state based terror wins Western approval.

ISBN 0850362970