

Illick Presents His Case For Unilateral Disarmament

By J. ROWLAND ILLICK
Assoc. Prof. of Geography

The use of violence as a technique for resolving disputes has always presented a dilemma for man. Extensive has been the literature and talk on this historic and fundamental human issue. The editors of *The CAMPUS* have generously requested that I present some personal thoughts on the proposal that the United States government announce and pursue a policy of unilateral disarmament as a step toward world peace today.

This is a highly complex question, and although it may seem presumptuous, I shall endeavor to explore several of the facets of such a philosophy in the hope that some ideas may evolve to stimulate thought and discussion.

My treatment during these two articles will be developed in three steps. First, a brief account of the use of violence during my lifetime; second, the alternatives available in dealing with the international problems today; and third, the advantages of a unilateral disarmament policy.

Threats to peace and security were met when I was a boy living in central China in the early 1920's, by locking the gates to the city. The massive 60-foot-high wall surrounding the town was an effective safeguard. In this respect, the Chinese were employing a technique unchanged in a thousand years. During the ensuing 40 years, however, man's skill in producing mass death-dealing devices improved with such fantastic momentum, that the human mind has difficulty today in comprehending the magnitude of the weapons or their effect. For example, the world was horrified on August 6, 1945, when upwards of 100,000 men, women and children were killed by the first atomic bomb over Hiroshima, Japan. Yet, today, about 15 years later, a single medium-size nuclear weapon (20 megatons or equivalent to 1000 of the Hiroshima bombs in power) could be released by the United States or the USSR on virtually any target in the world!

Try to imagine a 100-plane raid on New York City or Plattsburg, New York, every night for 5575 nights (15 years) with each plane, carrying the type of bomb dropped on Europe during World War II. This

This view of the disarmament, first in a series of two articles by Prof. Illick, is presented in answer to the discussion of the problem by Lee A. Lendt, instructor in political science, which appeared in the Dec. 7 issue of The CAMPUS.

would equal a single 20-megaton blast (a megaton equals one million tons of TNT)! Linus Pauling wrote in the November 1961 issue of "Liberation" that he believes that the United States has 100,000 megatons of bombs in its arsenal and that the USSR has 50,000 megatons. Victory in a nuclear war today would seem to depend on being first with the bombs — an all-out affair, for a partial or token bombing would surely result in as complete a retaliation in kind as possible.

For this reason, many concerned groups such as the American Association for the Advancement of Science, which convened in Denver recently, noted that man is now capable of destroying the entire human race, and therefore passed a resolution stating that it was imperative that scientists redouble their efforts to help find an alternative to war as an instrument of national policy. In other words, they were so certain that a nuclear arms race would lead to war that they were willing to risk examining other alternatives.

There are other experts who feel that all-out nuclear war is too horrible and that this is the deterrent which will preserve "peace." Indeed, many activities of the United States government indicate that maintaining weapons superiority is the country's best security in the world today. Approximately half of every annual federal budget is allocated for military matters. Numerous large and small American business organizations and universities and their research staff are linked with the American military program. The United States arsenal now includes a full spectrum of weaponry with great "over-kill" capacity.

Philip Noel-Baker views "the constant competitive expansion of national armaments as a dominating factor in interna-

tional life" and a phenomenon of the 20th century. The size and influence of the military in American life has established new and significant patterns. Mr. Noel-Baker notes that "military assets are three times as great as the combined assets of United States Steel, American Telephone and Telegraph, Metropolitan Life Insurance, General Motors and Standard Oil of New Jersey," while the total acreage under Pentagon jurisdiction exceeds the areas of Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Delaware and Maryland. Military programs are required and integrated in many college and university curricula; retired military personnel are frequently invited to assume managerial leadership in industry, education and government. Scientists devote more and more energy to applied military problems. Is peace to come as a result of these efforts?

History has never indicated that power supremacy prevented war. In fact, the reverse may be more accurate. What will happen when Red China and many other countries acquire, stockpile, and test nuclear weaponry? Accidents or irresponsibility could result in a world destroyed. For these reasons, there are those who assert that as military power approaches infinity, security approaches zero. I agree with George Kennan when he says, "The cultivation of the ideal military posture will always be in serious conflict with any serious effort to ease international political tensions." An old world citizen once observed: "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

Continuation of the nuclear arms race will not only eventually destroy all people; it will also help to breed want, chaos, indecision and fear, conditions which lead man to abandon freedom and to accept tyranny.

If the American people accept the challenge of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and apply their time, money, imagination and brainpower in working toward solutions to world tensions instead of supporting the development of "massive retaliatory power," the goal of friendly world relations may well be achieved.

(To be continued next week)