FOR RELEASE AT 1 P.M., EST (12 NOON, CST)
MONDAY, APRIL 16, 1956

"PEACE THROUGH THE PRESIDENT'S
DISARMAMENT PLAN"

ADDRESS

BY

HONORABLE HERBERT BROWNELL, JR.
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Prepared for Delivery

before

The Houston Bar Association

Houston, Texas

Monday, April 16, 1956

Of all the issues that face us today, none is more critical than the problem of how to find a lasting and meaningful peace.

Last July at Geneva, President Eisenhower made it clear to all that the free world is not afraid to propose courageous action to achieve peace, and that the free peoples share common aspirations for it that transcend their differences.

Seated at the table with the President in the Hall of Nations of Geneva were heads of governments of the United Kingdom, France, and the Soviet Union. At this Conference the President advanced his "bombshell" proposal for securing peace--the exchange of military blueprints and reciprocal aerial inspection so that they would be relieved of the fear of surprise attack. This would be the beginning of a series of many other agreements for easing international tensions--an essential condition for a durable peace.

People everywhere have been inspired by this proposal, impressed by its workability, convinced of its practicality. People everywhere are rallying in support of it. They know that scientists and military strategists have not exaggerated the frightful alternatives in a thermonuclear war both for nations who are parties to it as well as those who remain neutral.

In a matter which so profoundly affects the future of our country, a plan of this kind can only be carried through under our constitutional processes of government with the undivided support of the people.

In a free nation such as ours, careful consideration and an informed judgment respecting the plan requires the most thorough public discussion. For this reason, I should like briefly to discuss with you today the President's efforts to promote an era of peace and security for all nations of the world.

Some of the principal questions that immediately come to mind in this connection are: What is the President's plan and what steps are being taken to make it effective? What are some of the counter-proposals of other countries? What progress has been made in recent months on the road to peace? What is the role that our people must play in order to unlock the gateway that leads to a lasting peace?

First, a few words as to the President's plan and the action taken under his personal direction to gain our goal.

The plan itself is a simple one for avoiding the danger of a surprise attack. Under the first step, the Soviet Union and this country would furnish each other with information of military establishments and provide each other with facilities for unrestricted aerial reconnaissance.

The military information to be exchanged would include among other things, the identification, strength, command structure, and disposition of personnel and equipment of all land, sea and air services. There would also be an exchange of information about military plants, facilities and installations, including their locations. In order to verify the accuracy of the data which is furnished, a ground inspection service would be established in each country. It would be unhampered in investigating information, and entirely free to communicate its findings to its country.

In addition to ground inspection forces, the President has proposed unrestricted aerial inspection. This goes to the heart of his plan. Observers of the country being inspected will be stationed on board the aircraft.

When the extraordinary capability of modern aerial reconnaissance is recognized, we cannot but have confidence in the President's plan for aerial inspection. You can see the dimples of a golf ball from more than 6,000 feet. In two hours, a strip of about 500 miles wide and more than 2,500 miles long can be photographed by two jet photo-planes. It is estimated that within six months we could have a picture, mile by mile, of every field and factory in the Soviet Union. With this information in our hands, it could be kept current on a weekly basis through continued flights. Even under adverse weather conditions and at night, accurate results are possible.

This plan is not a substitute for disarmament. This is, as Mr. Stassen aptly describes it, "a gateway to disarmament."

With a thorough system of inspection in effect and respected, no nation will feel the danger of trickery or any crippling surprise attack. Under the President's proposal, as soon as the inspection plan is fully operative, and each country knows that the other is proceeding in good faith, the nations can safely move towards universal, simultaneous and proportionate disarmament and other far-reaching measures in the campaign for peace.

On the other hand, without inspection no nation can be certain when another will betray it. Without inspection, any disarmament proposals under the existing conditions of fear and suspicion would--to quote the words of Foreign Minister Pearson of Canada--"merely be a cruel and hupocritical delusion, and could be put forward only for propaganda." As the President has said out of hiw own long and wise experience: "The lessons of history teach us that disarmament agreements without adequate reciprocal inspection increase the dangers of war and do not brighten the prospects of peace."

The principle of mutual arms inspection has already been provided for in the pact of the Western European Union. It is contributing to improvement of relationships between Germany and France and all the nations of Western Europe. Its extension to all other great nations would be a milestone in the progress of civilization. It tends to assure that nations which have agreed to disarmament will abide by their agreement. It is essential to maintain the confidence and strengthen the trust vital to the life of such agreements.

Prior to launching the Plan for Peace, the President had already set in motion the machinery which would help to carry the Plan to safe shores. He appointed Harold E. Stassen, as his Special Assistant on Disarmament, and made this position one of a Cabinet-level dignity. Mr. Stassen was also appointed as United States Deputy Representative to the United Nations to follow through on the international negotiation aspect of his assignment. In addition, he represents the United States on the Disarmament Commission's Subcommittee which includes the United States, the

United Kingdom, France, Canada, and the Soviet Union. In this way, all disarmament matters can be coordinated by a single administrator directly answerable and responsible to the President. In his dealings with foreign governments, Mr. Stassen is under the direction of Secretary Dulles, and with respect to negotiations in the United Nations, he is under the direction of Ambassador Lodge.

To assist him, Mr. Stassen has chosen a small staff of exceptionally competent men loaned by the Department of State, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Central Intelligence Agency. A special interdepartmental agency has also been established. It has representatives of the agencies just mentioned, representatives from the Department of Justice in event legal problems arise; and representatives from the United States Information Agency to keep world opinion fully informed of developments.

At the direction of the President, Mr. Stassen has also invited a number of leaders in American life to undertake a study of the requirements and method of effective international inspection and control. Included among these task forces are some of our most distinguished nuclear physicists, some of our greatest retired military leaders, some of our most renowned industrial and communication leaders, and some of our top financial and budget experts.

The task forces which these distinguished men head are drawing up detailed plans of how to inspect, where to inspect, what to inspect and when to inspect. Their plans will tend to insure the greatest safeguards against a surprise attack and the most effective means of supervising an international arms limitation agreement.

Thus far I have discussed the first steps of the President's Plan for peace and how he has gone about implementing it. Now what are some of the primary counter-proposals of other nations?

The French Government has proposed that the nations should agree to a reduction in military expenditures as a first condition to gradual disarmament. It has also recommended that the savings from this disarmament program should be allocated in whole or in part to an International Fund for mutual assistance of under-developed countries.

The United Kingdom has proposed as a first step a practical test on a limited scale of international inspection of an area on either side of a line dividing Eastern and Western Europe. It is felt that if this pilot test worked satisfactorily, it would increase mutual confidence in Europe and set a pattern for more comprehensive inspection proposals which have been advanced by the President. A similar suggestion was made by Mr. Stassen for a pilot test both in the United States and the Soviet Union involving a non-sensitive strip of about 20,000 miles.

Let us now consider the Soviet proposals as enumerated by Soviet Premier Bulganin.

The Soviet has stated that it has no objection "in principle" to the mutual exchange by it and the United States of information concerning armed forces and armaments. Next, the Soviet does not feature the aerial inspection plan, but has not completely rejected it. The Soviet would like to station ground observers at strategic points such as larger sea ports, railroad and highway junctions, and airfields. It claims that creation of these inspection controls would tend to prevent

dangerous concentrations of troops and combat equipment on a large scale and diminish the possibility of sudden attack by one country against another.

We feel that this plan might have merit if ground inspectors had adequate powers and immunities. But in any event, ground inspection alone would fall far short of furnishing adequate security against surprise attack or as furnishing a basis for arms limitations and reductions. It must be augmented by air inspection to be fully effective.

The Soviet also proposes that the levels of armed forces should be reduced; and if aerial inspection is to be adopted that consideration be given to extending it to all countries. We are not far apart on these proposals.

First, the United States need no longer demonstrate our willingness to disarm. We have already voluntarily done so. From twelve and a half million near the end of 1945, we cut our forces to a million and a half men before the Korean conflict. However, events producing tension since that time have compelled us to increase our armed strength. Second, we feel that other nations will voluntarily agree to mutual inspection as soon as they see the plan work successfully between the Soviet and the United States. Third, we are already bound by our United Nations agreement not to use atomic weapons except to defeat aggression and we intend to honor our obligation.

The Soviet Union is not entirely satisfied in this score. They have been wanting us to agree not to be the first to use nuclear weapons in event of war, and then only if the Security Council agrees. This proposal is unacceptable to the United States. It would deprive

a law-abiding nation such as ours of its principal weapon, and make those countries which had the greatest conventional means of warfare, such as planes, submarines, and armed forces, the strongest military power on earth. As Ambassador Lodge observed: "The true democracies of the world, by their very way of life have traditionally been forced to accept the first blows in war. * * * Should they agree not to use their most powerful weapons in their own defense after taking that first blow, or if they should subject their self-defense to Security Council veto, they would be committing suicide."

Thus you can see that by and large there are already broad areas of agreement between us. Apart from the use of atomic weapons in event of attack, the differences that exist are principally in the approach to the problem of attaining peace--in the order of business, so to speak.

The President feels, and experience supports his view, that a disarmament plan would fail unless there was in effect a comprehensive inspection plan. How else could any one determine whether a party to the disarmament agreement was breaching it?

The President summed up the situation in a recent press conference. He said:

> "The Russians apparently continue to put down as the most important thing that there be an agreement of some kind before there is any system of determining whether either of us is living up to the agreement.
>
> "We insist that we devise the means for determining the degree in which we are carrying out agreements before the agreements themselves take effect. Now, that, you can take it and put it in all its details, but that is the essential difference between the two sides."

Now what progress has been made by the nations toward a lasting peace?

Since last July, the conferring nations have been drawing closer on the need for establishing a reliable aerial and ground inspection as an essential condition for reductions of armaments.

During the last few weeks our representatives have been meeting with representatives of the other great nations in London in an attempt to break through the barrier that stands in the way of mutual security for the world. They seek to reach common ground from which fear and suspicion will be uprooted; in which the seeds of peace will always be fruitful; in which faith in international law and order will always be secure.

This is no easy task. It requires constant searching, fair compromise and utmost patience. The Soviet Union said "no" four different times to the President's Plan of devoting atomic energy to peaceful uses. Yet at Geneva, Premier Bulganin agreed to the plan and declared that the Soviet Union would join the International Atomic Energy Agency. So too, when it comes to accepting the President's Inspection-Disarmament Plan, it may take a long time before the Soviet Union agrees. It may involve many conferences and negotiations in the future. We must never be discouraged. These days, the voice of world public opinion for peace is too strong to be ignored.

It is almost like the preparation and travail that goes into climbing a high mountain. The climbers do not turn back nor is their confidence impaired because they slip back at various points. They retrieve the lost ground and continue on avoiding other pitfalls until

the assault has been completed and the mountain scaled. The cause is too important to ever stop trying. We are not going to succumb to a feeling of frustration just because the task of finding the solution to these problems is at times disheartening and very elusive. Regardless of the difficulties, we are going to try again and again and again.

It is well worth our every unremitting effort. For the peace we seek today is different from any other ever attained by our civilization. It does not mean the mere quieting of bombs until nations can rebuild their war machine for still a bolder, more devastating attack. It means a peace which will restore the faith of people that preparation for war is no longer necessary. It means a peace which will bring to the workman, the farmer, the teacher, the businessman, the scientist, the housewife, and others a feeling of relaxation, relief from grim tension, and opportunity to work toward the betterment of humanity.

What role must all of us play in the difficult days ahead to attain such a peace?

The matter of peace is not one solely for diplomats and statesmen. It must be in our hearts. It must be striven for with the same unity, effort and resources as we gird for war. If all the people gave the same attention and national sacrifice to peace, we would soon have no occasion to be apprehensive of war. Our diplomats and statesmen will continue to look to the people for direction and guidance. The people must not fail them through indifference, or discouragement in the face of occasional reverses. The people must lend their strength, their voice, their intelligence, their concern, their support. For peace means the same thing in every tongue, in every land, and in every heart.

It is within the reach of all who would exert themselves to find and preserve it.

It is true that the Soviet Union's past history places a particularly heavy duty upon it to demonstrate that it seeks peace in good faith. Nevertheless, our country will meet them half way.

As Americans--and I might add, as Texans--you do not scare easily. But who of us interested in the survival of the human race would like to tangle with an H. Bomb that has the force of a million tons of dynamite? What choice then do the free people of the world have but to unite in seeking agreement upon an international system of law and order which will assure a durable peace?

We must not, therefore, permit fear nor prior Soviet conduct to chill our diplomacy into inaction. On the other hand, we must not allow our deep yearning for peace to drive us into hasty or ill-advised bargains which we will repent in leisure. It must be a just and honorable peace for both the strong and weak nations.

There is ample work to be done by all of us, as we await the outcome of future negotiations.

First, we must not let down our guard, lull our people into a sense of complacency or false security, or abandon our collective security. Let none of us ever be deluded by any change from Stallingrad to Collectivegrad! Our strength must continue to be adequate in our own defense and for resisting aggression against any free nation.

Second, our vigilance and cooperation in the field of internal security must constantly be re-examined, reinforced and revitalized, with proper balance maintained so that our precious heritage of ordered liberty

is never imperiled. Our ideals about the rights of man and individual dignity must always be preserved and advanced.

Third, the faith of free people in their system of government, in their institutions, in their traditions, must constantly be strengthened through just, fair and humanitarian acts.

Fourth, we must keep the economy of our country sound and stable by encouraging free enterprise, by opening up new business frontiers, by striving to provide the people with a peace prosperity such as it has never enjoyed before.

Fifth, consistent with adequate defense needs, sensible limitation and reduction in armaments must gradually be made, for obviously an armaments race is bound to drain from each nation valuable assets which would otherwise advance the cause of progress at home and abroad.

Sixth, we must constantly be searching for new formulas, methods and instruments by which international disputes are settled by negotiation, arbitration and resort to law and justice--and here again we must set the precedent for others to follow.

By these means we may devote more of our human, material and scientific resources to a fuller and happier life for all; to enriched cultural opportunities; to expanded educational, health and insurance programs; to reduced taxation; to the elimination of poverty, slums and inadequate housing which breed delinquency and crime at home; and to the assistance of underdeveloped countries and oppressed peoples abroad.

By these means history will record that the United States, as the mightiest of nations, played the role of peacemaker, in order to insure survival of mankind, to preserve its freedom, and assure for all people their just rights in a better tomorrow.