

# Olof Palme: World peace, super powers and national independence

Olof Palme, Prime Minister of Sweden and chairman of the Social Democratic Party, delivered a speech at the Congress of the Union of Christian Social Democrats in Sweden in Piteå, August 4 1974.

Olof Palme's address is reprinted in this booklet, which is published by the Swedish Social Democratic Party.

# Olof Palme: World peace, super powers and national independence

1974.



# Olof Palme: World peace, super powers and national independence

Published by the Social Democratic Party of  
Sweden — Socialdemokraterna  
Cover and graphic design: Gösta Ohlsson  
Cover photograph: Per Pettersson  
Printing office: Sjuhäradsbygdens Tryckeri AB,  
Borås, Sweden, 1974  
ISBN 91—532—0056—X

This year Sweden celebrates a unique anniversary. We have had peace for 160 years.

We are not celebrating this anniversary with any blare of trumpets. Nor is there any cause for an outburst of selfrighteousness. Instead it gives cause for a feeling of humility and thankfulness knowing that our people have thus been spared the terrible sufferings of war and been able to build society in peace. The fact that we have had peace is in no way due to any moral superiority of the Swedish people. It is the result of fortunate circumstances and coincidence, to be sure, wise policies in certain situations, but also a good deal of luck.

The fact that our country and our people have been preserved from war for more than one and a half centuries is a great privilege. We are constantly reminded of how great this privilege is by looking at the world around us, where we can see war and destruction, suffering and death.

Exactly ten years ago, Tage Erlander took the initiative to establish a peace research institute in Sweden. The idea originated in a motion to the 1964 Congress of the Social Democratic Party. With its long tradition of peace, Sweden wanted to support serious and independent research aimed at preventing war and interstate

conflicts. So very much research is concerned with the potentials of war. Hardly any research is done into the conditions necessary for peace. The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, SIPRI, was established by the Swedish Parliament in 1966. It has developed into a respected and important opinion-moulding organ in the international debate on peace and disarmament.

### **The arms race continues**

SIPRI reports of the last few years about armaments in the world do not make encouraging reading. In spite of negotiations on limiting nuclear arms and on force reductions, and in spite of current efforts to promote détente, development in weapon technology and production is being speeded up faster than ever before. There is a lot of talk about disarmament; in practice, the arms race continues. Total military spending in the world in 1973 amounted to 207 billion dollars according to SIPRI's analyses. That is more than 6 per cent of the world's total gross national product. It is equivalent to the total national income of the poor countries of the world. Military research and development now costs about 20 billion dollars a year and em-

ploys about 400 000 scientists and technologists throughout the world. The United States and the Soviet Union alone account for 85 per cent of the world's total expenditure in this field.

It is the rich industrial states that account for the overwhelming share of the world's military spending. Four states — the United States, the Soviet Union, France and Great Britain — account for 70 per cent of total expenditure. But an increasing number of states and regions are taking part in the arms race. It appears that the developing countries are allocating an increasing share of their resources to armaments. In 1972 and 1973 they ordered arms for nearly 2 billion dollars. This year we have read about an increasing number of contracts with the third world in the international arms trade. Increasingly modern types of weapons are being made available for export. Countries are trading weapons for oil.

### **The Middle East**

The Middle East has become one of the most militarized regions of the world. In the period between the Six-Day war in 1967 and the October war in 1973, Israel and Egypt more than doubled their military expenditure. More than

4 000 tanks and 2 000 aircraft were engaged in the October war in 1973. With the help of the other very advanced weapons put at the disposal of the belligerents by the two super-powers, about one-third of the aircraft and one-half of the tanks engaged in the war were destroyed, in addition to the large-scale losses in human life.

A very large proportion of the material losses are said to have been replaced by the Soviet Union and the United States.

In addition to this, there are large-scale military buildups by countries around the Persian Gulf, the strategic importance of which has increased dramatically as a result of the oil crises.

### **Vietnam**

Another example from SIPRI's studies: United States expenditure on the Indo China war in the form of military aid to South Vietnam is estimated at over 4 billion dollars for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975. Only six countries in the world have a total military expenditure exceeding this figure. This indicates the scale of military activity in Vietnam in spite of the cease-fire agreement. Vietnam has certainly not been given peace.

The arms race is, of course, a terrible waste of the world's resources. Consider for a moment if these resources could instead be used for the development of the poor countries, in the struggle against suffering and poverty. The military spending of those countries giving development assistance is almost thirty times as high as their aid to the developing countries. What if all the knowledge, all the ingenuity now being used to develop increasingly terrible weapons of destruction were fully concentrated on fighting backwardness, starvation and diseases? Quite simply, practical and constructive action in order to secure peace.

May I draw your attention to another very frightening aspect.

The enormous weapon arsenals of the world constitute a fatal threat. They create and sustain an explosive situation.

### **The nuclear threat**

The fundamental element in efforts towards disarmament is to check the arms race in the nuclear weapons field. In the past two months no less than six countries have exploded nuclear devices. This means that more countries have carried out nuclear explosions than ever before



in so short a time. Sweden protests strongly against this escalation of an already dangerous situation.

Efforts to make the Non-Proliferation Treaty all-embracing are being impeded. In the same way these nuclear tests cast their shadow over our work for a comprehensive test ban.

The present nuclear powers are greatly responsible for this unfortunate development because they have not taken more effective action to achieve nuclear disarmament.

For what are the super-powers doing?

In the period of 1963—74 the United States have increased the number of land-based inter-continental nuclear missiles from 424 to 1 054 and the number of submarine-based nuclear missiles from 224 to 656. The corresponding figures for the Soviet Union are 100—1 576 and 100—636. In 1972 alone, the year the SALT Agreement was signed, the number of strategic nuclear warheads in the United States increased from 5 890 to 7 040 and in the Soviet Union from 2 170 to 2 260. During the period since the signing of the Partial Test Ban Treaty in 1962 up to 1974, the United States have carried out 260 underground nuclear tests and the Soviet Union 136.

### 15 tons of TNT for everyone

Some years ago, the Nobel Prize Winner, George Wald, estimated that the destructive power in the hands of the great powers was so great that it equalled fifteen tons of TNT for every human being in the world — men, women and children. Presumably this figure is higher today. It is more than enough to completely destroy human civilization.

The leading great powers thus command a programmed system for destroying their adversaries. The inter-continental ballistic missiles are mounted, ready to fire, on their platforms and on submarines, sighted on pre-determined targets. They have developed defensive ABM systems for shooting down incoming missiles. They are developing offensive MIRV systems (multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles) with clusters of nuclear warheads on each missile, so that the number of possible targets is many times greater. And there is talk of new, more destructive weapons and even more ingenious strategies.

But neither of the great powers can destroy the adversary in the first nuclear attack. They must reckon with the opponent being able to hit back with terrible strength. With the gruesome

precision used in this field, estimates have been made of weapon effects showing that one-fourth of the opponent's population and one-half of his industrial production will be wiped out in the first counterattack.

### **Mutual assured destruction**

This has been called "mutual assured destruction", fittingly abbreviated to MAD. It is on this measurement that the concept of parity or balance of power is based. It is the starting point for détente considerations in the context of national security policy.

The present situation must be a constant nightmare for the great powers. To most people these descriptions of modern means of destruction must sound like terrifying fantasies, which can hardly be rooted in reality. To the leaders of the great powers they are day-to-day realities. They invest enormous resources in the arms race in order to create security.

But the stronger they get, the greater their insecurity and uncertainty become. They live in the constant fear of the other side becoming temporarily superior, of the discovery of a technological innovation that will change the situation overnight. They drive themselves into speeding

up development work and this exerts an enormous economic strain. They are constantly confronted with the risk that the making of a mistake, a wrong judgement, an accident, will result in that mutual assured destruction.

### **Terror balance**

The new relationship between the two superpowers that has emerged in recent years rests on a mutual acknowledgement of the fact that a nuclear war between them must be avoided at any cost. This, anyway, is a triumph of good sense, if one can speak of good sense in this context. A great variety of strategic doctrines have emerged about how strong, how accurate, and how impregnable nuclear weapons must be if they are to maintain the balance of terror, so that neither of the two powers should be tempted to make, or frightened into making, the first attack. It has become a kind of game of pitch and toss with more or less speculative theories which, as we have seen, can all be used to justify the replenishment of the already deadly arsenals held by both sides. In a moment of candour at a press conference in Moscow not long ago, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger declared that both the Soviet Union and the United States had

trouble with their military men when trying to settle agreements.

### **Disarmament talks**

However, agreement has been reached that the armaments situation, as of now, is to be regarded as one of parity or balance. And of course we must not belittle the results that have been achieved: the Test Ban Treaty and the hot line, the Outer Space Treaty, the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the SALT Agreement of 1972, and the summit meetings of 1973 and 1974. Disarmament has not been achieved, but certain limitations have been put on continued rearmament in certain fields. Negotiations are still going on in various fields. We have no reason to doubt the will of the great powers to reach agreements that prevent nuclear war breaking out between them.

But the deadly threat remains. However, it is not only disagreements between the two leading powers — strategic, ideological and economic — that constitute a threat to peace. There is a state of ferment in many parts of the world. There is the struggle against colonialism, oppression and dictatorship, the striving of peoples for liberation from foreign oppressors and their mas-

ters at home. There are deep antagonisms between nations within one region. There we see poverty and suffering and the growing gaps between different parts of the world, inequalities which in the long run constitute the main threat to peace. The great powers are affected in one way or another by all the crises that can erupt in various parts of the world. The realization of the risks this involves must also be something of a nightmare to them.

### **Political implication of détente**

The political implication of détente is that Washington and Moscow seem to have agreed to recognize and show respect for the interests of the opposite number and to keep a careful eye on all the crises in the world that could ultimately lead to nuclear war. That must be avoided at any cost. They do not want to let this kind of crisis get "out of control" as it is called, and they want to be able to intervene in one way or another in order to get the situation just "under control". The very use of these words reveals an assumption that very much affects the interests of other states and particularly those of small states. Putting it simply we may say that the great powers make the following claim:



In order to prevent a nuclear conflict, which would be disastrous for everyone, the great powers have the right, and almost an obligation, to intervene if a local conflict tends to develop into a world conflagration. The hot line is a concrete expression of this mutual interest. They appear, somewhat paradoxically, to be of the opinion that their arsenals of nuclear weapons give them the right to intervene in the interest of world peace. This way of thinking involves certain complications and dangers to the small states, of which I shall speak later.

It may be of interest to consider some of the past year's international crises from the point of view of détente policy.

### **Crises in the Middle East and Cyprus**

During the course of barely a year, two crises have hit the eastern Mediterranean: the Arab action against the areas occupied by Israel in October 1973 and now the military coup in Cyprus, which led to the Turkish military action only a few weeks ago. These two crises had quite different historical and factual backgrounds, but they have one feature in common. In both cases, it has been a matter of states wishing to protect or reconquer areas with populations

which ethnically or for religious reasons belong to their own peoples. The Arab states despaired of being able to use political means to get back areas occupied by Israel during the June war in 1967. So they decided to use force. Turkey considered that the Turkish minority in Cyprus was exposed to a deadly threat as a result of the Athens-inspired coup in Cyprus. So they took up arms.

In both cases, the states concerned took the military initiative in a mood of desperation at being confronted with situations they considered to be grossly unjust and a threat to their own safety. As they saw the situation, they had no choice.

This can, of course, not justify resorting to armed force. Whatever the situation, we must uphold the UN Charter's prohibition of the use of all armed force across borders. We must leave no avenue unexplored to negotiate a peaceful agreement.

But how did the states concerned reason?

Egypt and Syria had obviously come to the conclusion that in the prevailing détente climate they could not get effective support from the superpowers for making the change in the status quo that the return of the occupied areas

would mean. That was one of the reasons why they resorted to armed force. No matter what the fortunes of war might be, they could count on the superpowers reacting promptly and effectively in order to prevent the conflict spreading, and then they would at last get to grips with the task of solving the political problem of the return of territory. Now they could lend weight to their assertion that as long as this problem remained unsolved, there was a danger of new violent eruptions and this constituted a threat to détente.

Whether or not this is an accurate description of their reasoning, the détente mechanism worked along these lines.

A conference on peace between Israel and its Arab neighbours has at last been initiated and a process commenced that can lead to a peaceful future for the much-tried peoples of the Middle East, even if the knottiest problems still have to be solved.

In the militarily and politically hypersensitive area of the eastern Mediterranean, the superpowers have similarly regarded it as vital to their interests to avoid open and lasting conflict. As soon as the Cyprus crisis broke, they immediately got into contact with one another.

We can safely assume that the hot line was in frequent use. No one knows what was discussed, but we are probably not far out if we assume that there was full agreement throughout that the situation in and around Cyprus should not be allowed to develop so that balance was essentially disturbed, and risks of the conflict spreading arose. This concord was an essential condition for the Security Council being able to pass a unanimous resolution on ceasefire and the initiation of negotiations as early as on the second day of the Turkish action. And it was this concord that persuaded Turkey and Greece to comply with the call for ceasefire within 24 hours.

Now other international agreements have been made: the Geneva agreement and the decision of the Security Council to allow United Nations forces to take up positions between the parties.

Some observers in Sweden have reflected that the Cyprus crises shows how fragile détente is. It has been said that if a war can break out in southern Europe then it can just as easily break out in northern Europe. Therefore, we must have more armaments. This kind of thinking is rooted in a misunderstanding — assuming that it is not purely a tactical weapon for criticising our defence policy. Détente is, of course, no guarantee

against crises and local wars. It could not prevent Turkey from resorting to arms and perhaps, as I just said, it was quite simply part of the reason for the Arab action in the Middle East.

But the important point is that because of détente, strong forces were immediately put to work to limit and localize the conflict. Negotiations were initiated for the purpose of eliminating the causes of new conflicts. This is how détente has worked and to this extent it can be said to have had a positive effect.

### **Détente and the small states**

It is essential to bear this in mind. But it is also important to note that détente is by no means without its problems for the small states. We are living in a time when the hegemony of the super powers grows stronger and stronger. Their power is unparalleled. It is most obvious in the field of weapon technology. But it is also true in the technological, scientific and economic fields. This can mean a threat to the independence of the small nations. If they are to hold their own, they must have the ability to establish mutual solidarity and unity in order to seek international solutions of problems.

When such views are expressed the leaders of the great powers sometimes react with annoyance. It is we who are defenders of the peace, they say. It is we who ensure that nuclear war is avoided, that conflicts are limited, that order prevails. This, so to speak, is a moral justification of the predominance of the super states. Its maintenance is in the interest of everybody, it is thought. There is some justification for this way of thinking in certain situations. This makes it particularly essential that we should be very aware of the dangers it can involve for the small nations.

Moreover, it is in the essence of détente that the superpowers prefer the preservation of status quo to change. It also appears that the leaders of these two states do not object to the strain of conservatism this gives to the policy of détente. But just as development proceeds and constant efforts must be made if the national society is to preserve its vitality and its calm, we find situations constantly arising in the international sphere, both regional and global, situations that must be changed or eliminated if the international community is to live in peace. For the sake of détente, the superpowers may be so afraid of the consequences of every change

that they would rather accept the prolongation of an unjust or dangerous situation. In this way too, the interest of other states are affected by détente.

As I said at your Congress nine years ago(\*), here we have a conflict in the world of today. With good will, it is fully possible, for example, to freeze the existing level in the field of nuclear weapons. But it is not possible to freeze the social and economic development in the world.

The demand for change is particularly great in the third world. The national, social and economic liberation taking place in many countries leads to demands for large-scale and rapid change. There, freedom and human dignity are felt to be more necessary than peace and détente. Attempts to check liberation will in the long run be an even greater threat to peaceful co-existence between nations. The objective of détente and disarmament cannot be attained until all peoples are free.

This view does not mean that we oppose détente between the superpowers. On the contrary, it has our sincere support. But we must

---

\*) The belief that demands for social justice can be answered by violence and military force is a illusion.

thoroughly consider its consequences. And it has been found that, after all is said and done, change *is* possible, even if in many cases it is conditional and uncertain.

### **Change is possible**

In the past year, democracy has made great strides in Turkey. This year the fascist dictatorship in Portugal has fallen. This year it has become clear that Portuguese colonial rule is on its last legs. At last, we can see a hope of peace and independence for the peoples of Angola, Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique. The miserable military junta in Greece has, at least for the time being, started to leave the arena.

Who has brought about the change? Of course, the mobilization of international opinion in the United Nations, in the Council of Europe and in international debate, has played an important role. But — to choose one's words carefully — it is probably indisputable that when these issues have been considered within the military alliances to which the countries concerned belong, power politics and strategic considerations have dominated over the will to uphold the ideals of democracy. If the opposite had been the case, the régimes would not have been able

to continue, at least not within the alliance. And the other power bloc has probably realized that respect for the interests of their counterpart is an important condition for avoiding anything more than verbal interference in its own sphere of influence, when the people there make demands for change.

It is the peoples themselves that have brought about the change. In spite of censorship, terror, torture and constant oppression, the demands for independence, democracy and social justice have been unquenchable. Many years of struggling against the oppressors have brought victory. True, it can be said that in Portugal it was military forces that overthrew the régime, and that in Greece the junta called in civilian politicians, but in both cases it is quite clear that it is public opinion that is the foundation and prerequisite for change.

### **Portugal and Greece**

Events in Portugal and Greece constitute examples of how anachronistic régimes, authoritarian juntas without the support of the people are doomed to political and moral bankruptcy. In the end, despite all their decess, torture chambers and weapon arsenals, they become

unable to govern the country, incapable of making society function. In the end they collapse on their own as it were, or are forced to call in civilians.

Oppressive régimes contain the seeds of their own destruction and people's yearning for freedom can never be completely stifled. It can always, and will always, flare up again. This is an important lesson for those who doubt in, or despair of, democracy.

### **Terror in Chile**

It also gives hope to those who are still fighting for their freedom. In Chile, peaceful change had been started with the support of the people. They tried to bring about change in a peaceful way, in spite of the interference of foreign capital interests, in spite of sabotage and economic difficulties and in spite of the fanatic opposition of the privileged classes. But the democratic régime was crushed by an appallingly brutal military coup. There were no interests of power politics involved there, not a shred of détente policy that could come to the aid of the Chilean people. On the contrary, Allende's government was felt to be a threat to the status quo in some other countries on that continent.

Now the terror continues, wave upon wave. It must continue because the junta lives in fear of the people. On Tuesday, a military court in Santiago sentenced four people to death — three military men and the former governor of the central bank. Their crime was that they had shown solidarity with the democratically elected government of Salvador Allende. But it is impossible to exterminate a people's longing for freedom.

Sooner or later, the bloodthirsty régime in Chile will disappear in its own infinite degradation and shame. But it is terrible to think of how much suffering people will have to go through before that happens.

In the last few days we have received shocking news from South Korea about death sentences passed on a great number of people.

Sweden is strongly opposed to capital punishment. For many years we have taken an active part in United Nations work to get it abolished. We shall continue to work for the mobilization of international opinion against the contempt for human life capital punishment represents. The Government therefore appealed to the President of the Republic of Korea to pardon the persons sentenced to death in Seoul.

When we are constantly hearing of wars and oppressing and atrocities in the world, it may be a temptation to feel that involvement matters little. But this is the wrong way of looking at things. It is obvious that a small country like Sweden has limited ability to influence developments. But we have an obligation to take part in the moulding of international opinion as far as we can. And if we look back at the involvement of our popular movements in events in Vietnam, in Chile, in Greece and Portugal, in countries in Africa, we have considered our concern to be very meaningful, because the cause has been a just one. And without lapsing into exaggeration, we can maintain that that may be of practical importance.

### **Role of United Nations**

It is natural for small countries like Sweden to regard the United Nations as an important instrument in the cause of peace and for the moulding of international opinion.

We are often forced to note that the United Nations has been powerless when it comes to stopping violations of the peace. This is not due to any faults in the Charter or in the organization of the United Nations, faults that could be



corrected by a few ingenious reforms. It is due to the fact that the great powers have not been sufficiently in accord and sufficiently farsighted to make use of the United Nations machinery in time in order to eliminate the immediate causes of peace violations. But even if for this reason the United Nations has been unable to prevent the use of armed force, the organization has nevertheless had an important role to play. Without its efforts, violations would undoubtedly have been on a greater scale. Without its efforts the sufferings of the peoples concerned would have been much, much greater. We have been told of many incidents in the latest conflict in Cyprus where United Nations soldiers, Swedish and others, have been able to save lives by instituting local ceasefires and by many other means alleviating the sufferings of the civil population.

Sweden has made a greater contribution than any other state as regards personnel for United Nations peacekeeping forces. Consequently, we have also given a positive answer to the Secretary General's appeal for reinforcements to the United Nations forces in Cyprus.

It is also typical that when it comes to implementing arrangements in the Middle East that

have already been agreed upon or are planned, it is taken for granted that the United Nations is given extremely vital tasks. This is a question of tasks that no organ other than the United Nations are capable of taking on. So we see that the United Nations holds its position as an essential and basically irreplaceable — although admittedly fragile and inadequate — instrument for the preservation of peace.

### **The problems on the future**

I have talked a lot about today's situation and today's crises and the conclusions we can draw from them. But the crux of the matter is how the situation will develop in the long run. It is a matter of the long-term security of the world and whether people will be able to survive and live under reasonable conditions.

The crucial question is: Are we together going to be able to create an international and national policy along the lines of a wise utilization and just distribution of the limited resources of the earth in order to satisfy the fundamental needs of people wherever they live on our earth? Gunnar Adler-Karlsson has demonstrated that this is the crucial question in his report to the World Population Conference:

In spite of all the technological advances during past decades, UNESCO has shown that, in absolute figures, the world has never had so many adult illiterates as it has today. ILO has shown that we have never had so many unemployed or under-employed as we have today. And the World Health Organization has shown that never before have so many people been without clean drinking water as there are today.

The question can be simplified even further: Is the world's rich minority prepared to make sacrifices, to give up any of its privileges and positions of power?

When such questions are to be considered, the United Nations is an indispensable forum. A number of the most important conferences of our time are being held this year under the auspices of the United Nations.

The Special Session of the General Assembly on raw material and development problems last spring.

The Conference on the Law of the Sea now in progress in Caracas. The World Population Conference in Bucharest this month and the World Conference in Rome this autumn.

Intensive work is being done in the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of

Outer Space, the Disarmament Commission in Geneva, the United Nations Environment Board in Nairobi and the regular UNCTAD conferences. Never before have the United Nations been in so active a phase.

Each separate problem being dealt with by these different conferences is gigantic. But they are all interwoven. They must be seen as one great complex. Take just one example:

A shortage of oil can lead to a shortage of fertilizers and this in turn will result in a shortage of food. The food problem is also bound up with the enormous increase in world population — 75 million more mouths to feed each year. It is also linked to the rising living standards in the rich countries accompanied by habits of living that more hastily consume the earth's resources.

The world's economic growth is now unequally distributed both within and between nations and leads to a frightening lack of social content.

The main goal of the United Nations development strategy is to give individuals in the developing countries wellbeing and work so that everyone will have better conditions of living. Economic growth does not automatically benefit all citizens. Instead, what happens in many

places is that the standard of some groups has been lowered although the average standard has been raised. There are often mechanisms in the development process that create poverty for the many, while the few increase their wealth. Solely to rely on the private profit motives as a development force invites such problems. "The green revolution" in the agriculture of developing countries, an unplanned industrialization and mechanization are examples of processes which have already created vast unemployment and degrading slums. It is essential to choose the types of production that avoid these effects, to identify the conflicts built into economic development and try to shape a programme that can bring wellbeing to everyone and not only the few. Therefore the economic and social structures of countries are decisive factors. Sweden takes this into consideration when shaping its international development policy.

### **Sweden's foreign policy**

In the face of the enormous tasks waiting to be done by the international community Sweden seeks to make a constructive contribution.

To put it very simply our policy can be summarized as follows:

First: *We wish to promote peace and disarmament.* We shall continue to pursue our non-aligned foreign policy. It is recognized and respected as a contribution to stability in our part of the world. We shall not acquire nuclear weapons. Sweden's accession to the Non-Proliferation Treaty is categorical. We are taking a very active part in efforts to create more humane laws of war at the inter-state conference in Geneva. Sweden has demanded a total ban of the use of particularly cruel weapons. We are prepared to continue our involvement in the United Nations peacekeeping forces.

Second: *We shall contribute to the development of the poor states.* We shall support the developing countries' own efforts to achieve economic and political independence and promote national sovereignty. We shall comply with the objective set up by the United Nations to transfer 0.7 per cent of GNP to the developing countries next year, a goal which we and Holland will probably be the only countries to attain in 1975. We are working for the democratization of international development efforts through giving the developing countries greater influence in the multilateral organizations. We uphold the principle that every state has the

right to make free use of its own natural resources.

Third: *We shall do all we can to counteract the despoliation of the human environment, the ruthless exploitation of areas of the earth that are the common property of mankind and promote a just distribution.* We shall be following up the initiative we took as regards the first environment conference ever to be held. This year we have signed a Nordic Convention on the Protection of the Environment and an Agreement on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea. We wish to replace the anarchy now prevailing, that primarily benefits the industrial countries with access to supermodern technology, with an international system of rules ensuring justice and guaranteeing that the common resources of mankind are responsibly used and looked after.

Fourth: *We want to see a more democratic international community.* Sweden wants to promote a shift in the international power structure in favour of the poor nations. This is also a question of eroding the power monopoly of the rich states and cutting back the influence of the multinational corporations. We shall continue to give our support to the liberation mo-

vements and help to mobilize opinion against dictatorship and violations of human rights.

Fifth: *We want to have strong international organizations, a strong United Nations.* It is necessary in all fields to have a control machinery under international rule if we are to avoid nationalistic or monopoly interests giving rise to new conflicts and to ensure that the new resources are made available to all countries. On these issues we seek to contribute towards a practical and effective internationalism.

In reality our choice lies between the predominance of the super-powers and the internationalism the multinational corporations represent on the one hand, and the broad co-operation between peoples across frontiers, and international organizations, — primarily within the framework of the United Nations — able to make effective decisions and implement decisions on the basis of international law, on the order.

### **A new world crises?**

Our choice is obvious.

We are now faced with this new global situation at the same time as the industrialized countries are confronted by extremely difficult problems of internal development.

Inflation is spiralling to heights breaking all postwar records, production is stagnating in several of the major industrialized countries, with the movements of oil money monetary problems are of a size and complexity never known before. Parallels are being drawn with the crises of the Twenties.

A spectre is being conjured up of a world economy divided into isolationist economic blocs raising defensive barriers against the rest of the world.

All these trends give rise to extremely pessimistic discourses. Famous scientists write books about whether mankind has any future at all. When we study these gloomy prophecies we find they all have one feature in common. It is not in unrestrained growth, in the private profit motive, in the capitalistic economic system there is hope of a bearable future.

The era of neocapitalism is drawing to an end, wrote an American professor a few weeks ago. It is some kind of socialism that is the key of the future. This socialism can be authoritarian and repressive. It can also put its faith in the will of human beings to take responsibility and to work together, in their sense of solidarity.

### **The need for solidarity**

The fundamental strength of social democracy is that it can see both domestic and international problems in the same perspective, and their common solution is called solidarity.

A Swedish poet has written the following words:

Solidarity is a wealth  
of untried possibilities

The future is adventure  
and there is a freedom:  
to find release through fellowship.