

Formal Address at Vienna
20 September, 1958.

It is a very great and sincere pleasure to have this opportunity of expressing the thanks of this Congress for the generous hospitality extended to it by the ^{Körner Foundation} ~~Austrian Government~~. At this difficult time they have shown an enlightened liberality in encouraging free and serious discussion amongst men of varied nations and political creeds of matters that are of fundamental importance to the whole future of the human race

It may be not without interest to mention that 103 years ago, during a war between Russia and the Western Powers, my grandfather, at that time British Foreign Minister, attended a diplomatic conference in your famous city which, it was hoped, would lead to peace. He favoured terms which the Russian Government was willing to accept, but Napoleon III, envious of his uncle's military fame, insisted upon another twelve months of senseless slaughter. I, alas, cannot speak for the British Government, but I equally stand for peace.

The movement represented by this Congress has grown with surprising rapidity owing largely to the generous assistance of Mr. Cyrus Eaton and to the energy and organizing ability of Professors Rotblat, and ^{and Rabinowitz and Academician Skobelzyn.} Powell. The movement had a very small beginning. In 1955, ten eminent scientists joined with me in signing a pronouncement on the dangers of nuclear war and the importance of finding ways to prevent it. A great many scientists found themselves in sympathy with this pronouncement. Science, unintentionally and almost accidentally, has caused by its discoveries an unforeseen possibility of vast disaster. Many men of science have, in consequence, felt it a matter of conscience to do what

lay in their power to prevent the evils which science has rendered possible. It is this feeling which has caused the growth of organizations such as ours, and of organizations with similar purposes in various countries. Men of science, however, were quick to perceive that much of what needs to be done lies outside the sphere of their special competence, and that the search for measures to avert the danger requires a wide co-operation. The combination of scientific and political questions which is involved in the problem of nuclear warfare causes a difficulty: it is difficult for scientists to think politically and for politicians to think scientifically. But some mingling of the two ways of thought is essential and must be attempted in spite of its difficulties.

*[What this Congress has accomplished
why, in my view, it is noteworthy.]*

The present Congress, during its sessions at Kitty Creek, has achieved a very notable success in passing (with out ^{abstention} ~~one dissent~~) a statement on the dangers of nuclear war, emphasizing that these can only be avoided if all war is renounced. It is a remarkable & encouraging fact that East & West were able to achieve this very comprehensive measure of agreement. I will leave further statements on the work at Kitty Creek to those who were present.

It is surprising and somewhat disappointing that movements aiming at the prevention of nuclear war are regarded throughout the West as Left-wing movements or as inspired by some -ism which is repugnant to a majority of ordinary people. It is not in this way that opposition to nuclear warfare should be conceived. It should be conceived rather on the analogy of sanitary measures against epidemics. The peril involved in nuclear war is one which affects all mankind and one, therefore, in which the interests of all mankind are at one. Those who wish to prevent the catastrophe which would result from a large-scale H-bomb war are not concerned to advocate the interests of this or that nation, or this or that class, or this or that continent. Their arguments have nothing whatever to do with the merits or demerits of Communism or Democracy. The arguments that should be employed in a campaign against nuclear weapons are such as should appeal, with equal force, to Eastern and Western blocs and also to uncommitted nations, since they are concerned solely with the welfare of the human species as a whole and not with any special advantages to this or that group.

It is a profound misfortune that the whole question of nuclear warfare has become entangled in the age-old conflicts of power politics. These conflicts are so virulent and so passionate that they produce a wide-spread inability to understand even very obvious matters. If we are to think wisely about the new problems raised by nuclear weapons, we must learn to view the whole matter in a quite ~~a~~ different way. It must be viewed, as some new epidemic would be viewed, as a common peril to be met by concerted action.

Let us take an illustration. Suppose that a sudden outbreak of rabies occurred among the dogs of Berlin. Does anybody doubt that Eastern and Western authorities in that city would instantly combine to find measures of extirpating the mad dogs? I do not think that either side would argue: "Let us let the dogs loose in the hope that they will bite more of our enemies than of our friends; or, ~~if they are not to be let completely~~ . . ."

if they are not to be let completely loose, let them be muzzled with easily detachable muzzles and paraded on leashes through the streets so that, if at any moment the 'enemy' should let loose its mad dogs, instant retaliation would follow. Would the authorities of East or West Berlin argue that "the other side" could not be trusted to kill its mad dogs and that, therefore, "our side" must keep up the supply as a deterrent? All this is fantastically absurd and would obviously not occur to anybody as a sane policy, because mad dogs are not regarded as a decisive force in power politics. Unfortunately, nuclear weapons are regarded, quite mistakenly, as capable of securing victory in war; and because they are so regarded, few men think of them in a manner consonant with sanity or common sense.

Let us take a, perhaps, more apt illustration. In the fourteenth century the Black Death swept over the Eastern hemisphere. In Western Europe it destroyed about half the population, and in all likelihood it was about equally destructive in Eastern Europe and in Asia. In those days, there did not exist the scientific knowledge necessary to combat the epidemic. In our day, if there were a threat such a disaster, all civilized nations would combine to combat it. No one would argue, "Perhaps this pestilence will do more harm to our enemies than to us." Anybody who did so argue, would be considered a monster of inhumanity. And neither the Black Death nor any similar pestilence has ever offered as terrible a threat as is offered by the danger of nuclear war. The countries of NATO, the countries of the Warsaw Pact, and the uncommitted countries have precisely the same interest in this question. The same interest, in fact, as they would have in combatting a new Black Death. If this were realized by the statesmen and politicians of East and West, many difficulties which now seem insuperable, or nearly so, would disappear. I am, of course, supposing that the point of view which I am advocating would be adopted by both sides equally. Given a sane and sober consideration of what is involved, this harmony on the problems of nuclear

weapons would inevitably result. It would not be necessary to invoke idealistic motives, although they could be validly invoked. It would be necessary only to appeal to motives of national self-interest, for, owing to the nuclear peril, the interests of each have become the interests of all, and it is only in co-operation that any can survive. If nations can be brought to realize this fact, we may be on the threshold of a happier era than any previously known in human history.