

16324
10

SANITY or SUICIDE?

*Questions and Answers
about the threat of
nuclear war and what
we can do about it*

Published by
THE CAMPAIGN FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

6d.

Questions and Answers
about the
NUCLEAR THREAT

Foreword

THE Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament has been holding eight or ten public meetings every week. The people who come to them—and to the many smaller meetings arranged by local groups—are invited to ask questions. By now it is possible to list the questions which are most often met with; and it seemed useful, for the benefit of those who for one reason or another don't go to meetings, or whose question was not reached at a particular meeting, to set down the answers in permanent form.

There is no "party line" in the Campaign, and not everyone who adheres to its policy would give the same answer to each of the questions in this pamphlet. The answers have, however, been agreed to by members of the Executive Committee, and they represent as nearly as possible the collective view of the Campaign.

The first nine questions are concerned with matters of fact or of scientific estimate, and the answers have been prepared with the aid of distinguished experts. The other questions deal with our policy; the answers, while supported as much as possible by proven facts, naturally contain argument and the expression of opinion.

Of one thing we feel certain. To steer our country through this dangerous century, we must face and understand realities, rid ourselves of illusions, and settle down to some straight and hard thinking.

Sanity or Suicide?

is one of a number of pamphlets dealing with the issues involved in nuclear disarmament.

Others are:

In Ignorance Refrain, a pamphlet on Fall-out,
(1d.)

If Man is to Survive by Bertrand Russell, O.M.,
F.R.S., (1d.)

Tomorrow's Children. A pamphlet for women,
(4d.)

Who's going to be the Boss? A Broadsheet,
(1d.)

Famous Last Words, cartoons by Arthur Horner,
(1/-)

Postage 2d.

These are available from the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, 143 Fleet Street, London, EC4. Buy them and sell or lend them to your friends.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

about the

NUCLEAR THREAT

What would be the effect of a 10 megaton hydrogen bomb dropped on a city?

TO five miles in every direction from the explosion, all buildings, however sturdy, would be destroyed and everyone would be killed. There would be serious damage both by blast and by fire to a distance of twelve miles; in this belt the effect would be akin to that of a World War II raid, and the heat flash would inflict skin burns and eye damage on people caught in the open. Slighter damage from blast, especially to older houses, and fires caused by burst gas mains or damage to electric installations, could reach to twenty-five miles. Beyond these immediate effects, fall-out must not be forgotten.

What would be the danger from fall-out?

RADIOACTIVE particles cause injury to health, of a seriousness depending on the intensity of the radioactivity and the time of exposure. A big dose would mean death within hours or weeks from radiation sickness; a smaller dose could mean cancer or leukemia (incurable cancer of the blood), contracted months or years later; or it could mean only discomfort, weariness, headaches, and other minor symptoms. Radioactivity cannot be seen, or detected except with special instruments. Badly affected areas would have to be cleared, maybe for years. There would also be damage to foodstuffs, crops, cattle and other animals, and thus indirectly to milk, eggs, etc.

The danger area would not stretch evenly round the point of explosion, but would depend on the way the wind was blowing. Its extent likewise would depend on the weather. There would certainly be danger fifty miles from the bomb—probably as far as two hundred miles.

What would happen to Britain in a nuclear war?

THINK of the damage done by one bomb, as described above. Remember the disruption of medical services and the hopelessly inadequate supply of medicines and blood plasma for the millions of injured. Add the destruction of all normal services, gas, electricity, clean water supply, telephone, railways, etc. Bear in mind, too, that the minimum effect of radiation is to lower resistance to ordinary diseases—which there could not be enough doctors to treat. Finally, don't forget that this highly urbanized country lives on the import of food through a few big ports and on its speedy distribution.

If six hydrogen bombs fell on our major cities, they would kill at least ten million people outright; another ten million might die in a matter of weeks; and life for the survivors would be a wretched struggle against odds, with anything we can call organized or civilized social existence a mere memory. If the enemy were lavish with his bombs, or if the war continued after the first attack, there could quite easily be no survivors in Britain.

What are genetic effects?

RADIATION damages the human germ cells and causes changes in the genes which transmit characteristics from parents to children. Nearly all these changes, or mutations, are harmful. After a nuclear war, many survivors would be sterile—at least for a time—and could not have children; many more would produce children marked by lowered intelligence, general weakness, and poor resistance to strain or illness; and many would, without themselves being aware of injury, cause children to be born with various deformities or as idiots and imbeciles. Mutations cannot be reversed or cured. Unless and until those affected all died without having children, they would go on from generation to generation for thousands of years.

Can these effects result from nuclear tests?

YES; any addition to the radiation in the atmosphere, however slight, is harmful, though of course the tests do far less harm than the use of the bombs in war. The United Nations report reckoned that tests will cause the birth of somewhere between 2,500 and 100,000 afflicted children in future generations. The report assumed that there will be no more tests and was written before the American, British, and Soviet tests of 1958. This estimate was based on agreement between scientists of 15 nations; some authorities give much higher figures.

And do the tests cause cancer and leukemia?

SCIENTISTS warn us that this is a grave risk, but not a certainty. The fallout from the tests contains strontium 90, the element that causes these diseases by concentrating in bones, especially those of growing children. It may be that any amount, however small, is harmful, as with the genetic effects; or it is possible that there is a minimum dose below which we are safe. No scientist would say with confidence that there is a safety limit.

Even if there is one, it may soon be reached and passed. The amount of strontium recorded in 1959 is double that of 1958. The Western Governments have reckoned that tests with an annual fission yield of 10 megatons would keep the poisoning of the atmosphere within safe bounds, but twice this amount of testing was done by America alone in 1954, and again by the nuclear powers as a whole in 1957 and 1958. Dr. Charles Dunham, head of the medical division of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, has warned that America alone will have 300 extra cases of leukemia and cancer a year for the next 70 years because of the tests (once again, assuming that they cease).

Can nuclear weapons be tested without detection?

A SOVIET explosion as small as 3,400 tons of TNT was recorded in America, Sweden, and India. The need for on-the-spot inspection, now causing so much debate among the nuclear powers, applies only to the possibility of underground tests of the very smallest atomic weapons, and perhaps to bombs fired to distances beyond the earth's atmosphere.

How much warning would Britain get of an H-bomb attack?

LONDON is 900 miles from Soviet bomber bases and missile sites. Jet bombers can cover that distance in an hour and a half. Rocket missiles with nuclear warheads would take ten minutes or less. A radar defence screen

would have to distinguish rockets from meteors and be large enough to track each rocket in a big salvo. The chances are we would have little warning at our bases, none in our cities.

What about Civil Defence?

THE Government's 1958 Defence White Paper makes it clear that our homes and towns cannot be defended against nuclear attack. As *The Times*, Defence Correspondent wrote on October 17: "The civil population have been left virtually unprotected . . . Civil Defence . . . is in fact only a skeleton organization. There is no shelter or evacuation policy, and the £6,500,000 voted for Civil Defence this year is a token figure."

Vast expenditure on Civil Defence, giving it the same priority as the armed forces, huge shelters beneath tons of concrete, and the like, might enable some countries to mitigate the effects of nuclear war. Something like this is being attempted in the United States and Sweden, with a far less densely concentrated population than ours. In Britain the task is hopeless; the best efforts of Civil Defence would be like putting an Elastoplast on a bullet wound.

Why is it worse to be killed by a hydrogen bomb than by a bullet?

FOR the man who's killed, it isn't. But those who have the power can stop the bullets being fired when certain aims are achieved or a compromise peace seems desirable. In nuclear war, total disaster comes in the first hours, when cities, peoples, and nations are wiped out.

You can commit mass murder with conventional bombs, machine-guns, or swords. The H-bomb is the first weapon that can commit nothing except mass murder. A bomb in the last war might be dropped on a munitions factory or on a school; an H-bomb must inevitably smash schools even if it falls smack on a munitions factory. Its target can only be national life. It kills in neutral countries. It kills by radiation effects and by causing disease and hunger long after the war is over. It kills, by causing genetic mutations, for centuries to come.

In a nuclear war we should kill millions who have accepted Communism, millions who ardently oppose it, millions who think Communism and the colonialism they associate with us equally bad and want nothing of the quarrel. For ages to come, people will be maimed and suffering with as much comprehension as though people in modern Britain were suffering from the effects of the struggle between Rome and Carthage. That should put into perspective the unprecedented crime we are contemplating.

But why is it more of a crime than killing always was?

FOR one thing, because it is purposeless. Aimless killing has always been outlawed in war; that's why our soldiers are forbidden to shoot prisoners or shell towns that fly the white flag.

To say that the wickedness of a given action is unaffected by its scope, moreover, shows a strange disregard of the morality by which almost all of us conduct our lives. Most parents slap their children; those who thrash their children arouse our disgust. A police interrogation lasting three hours is efficiency; if it lasts twelve hours it is torment. There is a higher moral law than strict logic, one founded on humanity aided by common sense. And this law, we all know in our hearts, says that we can purge ourselves of the guilt of war, but never of the guilt of nuclear genocide.

But just because it's so repulsive, the H-bomb may never be used—like gas in the last war.

GAS was used in 1916 and failed to give the user any decisive advantage, especially after the gas-mask was invented. That—and the fact that prevailing winds in Europe are west—explains why Hitler didn't use it in the last war.

He may also have been deterred because Britain had stocks of gas. But the case of the H-bomb is quite different. It is intended, not to deter the Russian H-bomb, but to deter any Russian attack. Our whole strategy is based on it, and we intend to use it first if Russia does not. The Defence White Paper says: "If Russia were to launch a major attack on them (the Western nations), even with conventional forces only, they would have to hit back with strategic nuclear weapons."

Might there not be a tacit agreement to use only atomic bombs of moderate size?

IT's hard to believe that the stakes would not be raised, as in a poker game, until first a small and then a full-size hydrogen bomb was used. No belligerent would accept defeat rather than break the rules. But one has only to imagine a country like Britain spattered with Hiroshimas to see that this is almost as cheerless a prospect as all-out nuclear war.

But unless we rely either on the H-bomb or at least on atomic weapons, shouldn't we be at the mercy of Russia's vast conventional forces?

RUSSIA'S superiority in land forces is permitted quite voluntarily by the West. In population and in munitions industry the West can equal Russia, especially since the latter cannot rely on troops from satellite countries. Western Governments prefer to use their troops on enterprises like the Algerian war and to rely on nuclear weapons.

For Britain, and for all Western European countries, this policy is crazy. In conventional war, courage and skill have often won victory against odds. The one weapon which allows us no chance is the H-bomb.

Won't the prospect of nuclear war deter Russia from aggression?

AS we shall see, deliberate all-out aggression, with Russia suddenly launching her entire strength against the Western allies, is only one way in which war can begin. It isn't the most likely, and neither logic nor evidence suggest that Russia has such an intention. But if she has, our threats of immediate nuclear retaliation are a clear invitation to her to strike first and knock us out of the war.

Then hadn't we better make enough H-bombs to hit Russia harder than she can hit us?

THIS question ignores the difference between the hydrogen bomb and all previous weapons. The destructive power of the H-bomb is so immense that advantage goes not to the country that can hit harder, but to the country that can best survive the blow. We can do nothing to alter Britain's extreme vulnerability. If ten H-bombs fell on Britain, the fact that we had dropped a hundred or a thousand on Russia would do us no good whatever.

But at least the nuclear deterrent will make Russia watch her step.

THAT would depend on its being certain, in Russian minds and in ours, that it will be used. In that case, they would know that they could not get away with a local attack on a single Western country (though we still shouldn't know if they would keep the peace or strike first and obliterate us). Yet when Mr. Butler appeared on television to defend the Governments' policy, he was asked point-blank if he would order H-bombs to be launched if a Russian army attacked Greece. Even when it was pointed out to him that his whole case rested on giving a definite answer and on the Russians taking note of it, he refused to reply one way or the other.

The reason is obvious. Our "threat" is simply to commit national suicide. It's not likely that any Government would do it, especially since it wouldn't help Greece anyway. The Russians can justifiably regard the deterrent as a bluff. There is a case on record to reinforce this view. Russia's subjugation of Hungary in 1956 shocked the world and was solemnly condemned as aggression by the United Nations. But nobody in the West even suggested dropping an H-bomb on Moscow. Thus we were powerless to help Hungary, because we had put all our reliance on one weapon—the weapon we dared not use.

The Government tries to portray its policy of deterrence as "being on the safe side"; but in reality it is a desperate gamble. The Prime Minister blurted this out when he said: "If war comes, it will show that the deterrent has failed"—cold comfort to the victims! The policy really means that any aggression will face us with an appalling choice between humiliating impotence, as at the time of Hungary, or national suicide.

Haven't the atom and hydrogen bombs held the Communists in check since 1945?

LET'S look at the record. In 1950 Chinese armies poured into Korea and General MacArthur wanted to use the atomic bomb. In 1954 a French army was surrounded, facing certain defeat, in Indo-China; the Western governments discussed a nuclear strike to rescue it. These incidents have two things in common. The nuclear deterrent in Western hands had not prevented the happenings that so alarmed our Governments. And the deterrent was, when it came to the point, never used. Whatever has checked the Communist powers, it hasn't been the H-bomb.

What has it been, then?

ARMED aggression is far from being the only way in which the Communists spread their influence and power. Even the Defence White Paper says they will turn increasingly to "political subversion," and H-bombs are certainly no defence against that. The only real defence is to build communities politically and economically healthy enough to make Communism unattractive. The achievement of independence by India and other former British possessions, and their subsequent progress, have halted Communism in Asia. The Marshall Plan, which raised national wealth and standards of living, halted it in Europe. Wherever the West has relied on force and threats of force, it has suffered political defeats.

When the Russians blockaded Berlin in 1948, influential voices were raised to counsel a reply by force—even by the atom bomb. A more effective way was chosen. Non-violent resistance is often called unrealistic, but the Berlin airlift was a highly practical example of it.

Isn't this just the old pacifist argument?

THERE are no old arguments in a totally new situation. War has always been a horrible business, but once it at least had a purpose. The victorious nations ended up better off than before the war (though that has become more and more difficult), or anyway, better off than if they had lost. Life in Britain, obviously, is better than it would have been if Hitler had won. The pacifists contended that violence was never justified, even to gain a desirable end. Naturally, they are active now in our campaign. But they have been joined by many others who thought, and still think, that pacifism was the wrong choice in 1939.

For in a nuclear war—which isn't really a war, if "war" means contest—there can be no victory and no survival. By definition we could not emerge from it better off than under Soviet rule, for we should be dead. No aims, such as preserving democracy, national independence, or anything else, can be served by collective suicide.

So you don't believe in death rather than surrender?

IN the past, this motto was a noble one, for what it really meant was "death that others may live." Hundreds of thousands gave their lives in two world wars to ensure the survival in freedom of millions. The Spanish Republic fought to the end against Fascism, and gave the rest of Europe a chance to prepare its defences. We insult the men who died thus if we compare their sacrifice to the purposeless massacre of nuclear war. In all ages men who died for their wives and children have been admired; to admire men who insist that their wives and children should die with them is a new notion. There is neither courage nor honour in an indiscriminate slaughter of millions in Britain, Russia, and other countries.

Then you would submit to a Russian occupation?

WE refuse to admit that occupation and annihilation are the only alternatives. Our whole policy is designed to steer a way between those evils. It is the Government's present course that is most likely to end up by presenting Britain with that stark choice.

Yet, in this dangerous world, no policy can guarantee safety. And if the worst comes to the worst, we prefer that the human race should survive, even in the most tragic circumstances. The most ruthless empires in history have, in the course of time, disintegrated, modified themselves, become adapted to the terms on which they could gain co-operation from their subjects. In the past decade, the centralized Communist system has been obliged to permit two major exceptions: a Yugoslavia with an independent policy, a Poland without a secret police. To rule a country like ours, with a hostile population of fifty millions, would present Moscow, or any other Power, with enormous problems; the mere prospect makes more sense as a deterrent than the H-bomb.

Let us consider people now suffering under ruthless subjection—such as the native people of South Africa or for that matter the Hungarians—and ask if they would prefer to be dead.

Don't you think Communism is an unmitigated evil?

NEITHER the Christian nor the humanist can agree that any evil is proof against change and resistance. Communism, in any case, is a movement which has captured the devotion of many millions. This would be impossible

if it did not embody, in however distorted a form, humane aspirations such as those of equality, social progress, and wider opportunity; and if it had not, as undeniably it has, improved the material lives of millions. Looking round the world, it would be quite false to assert that all evil is concentrated within the Communist sphere, while all is light outside it—even in fascist Spain, slave-owning Arabia, and South Africa.

To say: "Communism is the enemy" and to think no further leads to the pitfall, into which some Western statesmen have fallen, of identifying all movements for social change and colonial liberation with Communism—and thus to make them enemies.

If the issue were crystal clear, it would still be wrong to vindicate it by mass murder; these considerations make reliance on the H-bomb yet more wicked.

So you think we should prepare for conventional war?

CERTAINLY not. Another conventional war would be terrible in itself. Europe has barely recovered from enduring two in fifty years and might crack under the strain of a third. Besides, the losing side would resort to nuclear weapons. Even if they had been outlawed and stocks destroyed, the knowledge would be there in the heads of the scientists and they'd be made again. Britain, we say, ought not to envisage taking part in another major war.

Surely your policy amounts to making Britain defenceless?

BRTAIN is defenceless now. Mr. Duncan Sandys has said so deliberately in two successive White Papers. And as a nuclear base we are worse than defenceless; we are an automatic target for the first hour of war. There can never again be any defence for Britain except the prevention of war.

You actually think we'd be safer without nuclear weapons?

WE are now engaged, along with America, Russia, and the allies of both, in a feverish arms race. In the past an arms race has always led to war, and this is one rule that the new weapons don't change. However, they make two differences, both for the worse. First, of course, the war will be more terrible than ever before. Second, it can begin more suddenly.

Earlier we discussed Soviet aggression. But in the history of war deliberate aggression is the exception. Most often, wars begin because there is a dispute; both sides make threats and mass their forces in the expectation that the other will back down; and the explosion comes without being planned by anyone. In the old days, the crisis lasted for a fortnight or a month, with troops being mobilized and sent to the frontiers. Now it is a matter of hours, for the threatening gestures are made with planes flying at 800 miles an hour. And the first blow will be so devastating that each side will want to forestall it. There is also the possibility of sheer miscalculation—a bomber off course, the misreading of a radar screen—which may occur even when there has been no political crisis. All of us are living permanently on the knife-edge of annihilation.

So you're opposed to bombers patrolling with nuclear weapons?

YES, for several reasons. There is a danger, unlikely but undeniable, of radioactive damage in the event of a crash. The flights increase the danger of war by accident to an intolerable degree. And they take the decision

of launching the bomber force from Britain out of British hands. The American bombers get their orders from headquarters in the U.S.A. If our Prime Minister is to be consulted about their use, as he claims, then the planes need not be in the air. If he is not, he has accepted a position that no British Government ought to allow.

What about the missile bases now being built?

WORSE still. We know from American sources that the nuclear bomber force has several times taken off because of a false alarm and been recalled. If a missile is fired, it can't be recalled. The war is on and Britain's fate is sealed.

What sort of disarmament would you like to see?

THERE is now a real chance of an agreement to stop nuclear tests, which cause deadly harm and have scarcely any real purpose, for both America and Russia now have enough bombs to end human life on earth. Agreement on this will be valuable in itself and create the right atmosphere for further progress.

Then the powers should move quickly toward an agreement to stop making bombs and destroy their stocks. If this is combined with agreement to reduce conventional weapons, so much the better. The figures for armed forces proposed by Russia and by Britain and France in recent years are not far apart. But nuclear disarmament should not be conditional on conventional reductions, both because this has led to endless haggling, and because the nuclear weapons are by far the greatest danger to the world. Above all, disarmament should not be dependent on settling political problems, or else it will be postponed till Doomsday.

This will involve inspection, won't it?

INSPECTION is very desirable, for a peaceful atomic plant can also produce plutonium for bombs. And inspection has a positive value. It could strengthen the United Nations and give us the nucleus of a world government, the only secure guarantee of peace in the long run. But an agreement without inspection would be better than none, for the world is sorely in need of a little trust.

Most people want a disarmament agreement. Why do you urge that Britain should give up her own H-bomb in advance?

BRTAIN is the only medium-rank power to make the H-bomb. There is a grave danger that she will soon be joined by others. France plans to test an atom bomb before long; West Germany is to have missiles with nuclear warheads, and, though the latter are to be in American keeping, it may soon be found "convenient" for the Germans to make them. This prospect arouses legitimate fears among nations which suffered at German hands in the last war, and throws a sprag in the wheel of the hopeful plans for disengagement and an atom-free zone in Central Europe. Now Switzerland wants atomic weapons, and the Chinese Foreign Minister has said, "We shall have nuclear weapons in future."

The danger is that other N.A.T.O. countries will want their own nuclear bombs; then the Warsaw Pact countries; then Egypt, Israel, and all kinds of small nations, some of them under very irresponsible leadership. A nuclear arsenal is cheaper and easier to build up than a powerful conventional army. The peace of the world would be at the mercy of any one of a score of national leaders.

British statesmanship could halt this rake's progress in time, but only if Britain renounces the bomb herself.

In addition to this positive motive for renunciation, there is a strong case against our having the bomb. It is useless as a defence or a deterrent; it is a heavy drain in money, materials, and skilled manpower; it makes us a priority target; and it holds back our progress in the peaceful use of nuclear power and in exporting atomic power equipment to less advanced countries, in both of which we have taken a lead that ought to make us far prouder than our bomb.

Still, we might as well keep it till Russia and America give up theirs.

AN agreement among the big nuclear powers to scrap their bombs has been sought in vain for years. Neither will do it if the step means conceding the slightest political or strategic advantage. If one of them is in the lead in the capacity to destroy, she will not reach agreement; if she's behind, she dare not. Britain so far has behaved in the same way.

Ought we to give up hope of an agreement? Not at all—but we ought to give it a shove forward. This we can do by giving up our H-bomb and calling on the others to follow our lead. This would be a declaration, proven by action, that we put the cause of human survival first, ahead of any advantage or sacrifice that may concern any nation, including ourselves.

But will they follow our lead?

IF they don't we shall be no worse off, since the bomb is a danger and not a protection to us. But it's high time we struck out in the right direction, even without a guarantee of success. We should have the support of many uncommitted nations. If we moved a resolution in the United Nations Assembly urging the Big Two to give up nuclear weapons and got a majority—as we could—it might be very hard for either power to reject it. Each would risk the drifting away of its allies or satellites, the contempt of the neutral states, and a revulsion of public opinion in their own countries, something that not even a dictator can wholly ignore.

Without H-bombs, shouldn't we lose our influence in world affairs?

ON the contrary. Our bombs and bombers are merely a part, and a very small part, of the Western—overwhelmingly American—nuclear forces. If we couldn't carry through a war against Egypt without American approval, how can we use our deterrent independently against Russia? So long as we are subordinated to American strategy and hence to American policy, we are unable either to impress Russia or to argue with America. That's why the British representative never took an independent line in the disarmament talks. The time is past when we can compete in the big-power stakes on a military level. But we can still be great in influence and in moral and political stature, as India has become, without making nuclear weapons. To renounce the H-bomb is the beginning of regaining our influence.

If we were weak, how could we push America toward a saner Far-Eastern policy, for example?

HOW can we now? For ten years Britain has recognized the Peking Government without persuading America to do so. Indeed, we can be committed to war and destruction by American policies which we have never endorsed—for instance, if America gets into war with China in defence of Chiang Kai-Shek and Russia joins in. Our capacity to influence America stops the moment the U.S.A. hints that American protection will be withdrawn if we are awkward. But once we recognize that protection by H-bombs is an illusion and propose positive steps toward peace, America will have to deal with us as, politically, an equal.

Would not a disarmed Britain be sheltering behind American power?

NO; we should make it clear that we want America to renounce the H-bomb, and don't wish for American bombs to be used in our defence. This involves requesting the United States to take its bombers and missiles away.

Shouldn't we lose American friendship and all our alliances?

ALLIANCES such as the Baghdad and South-East Asia Pacts have done nothing to check Communism or add to our influence. The North Atlantic Pact, which began as an agreement for mutual help in the event of aggression, has become merely the expression of the policy of nuclear deterrence. Its plans are to destroy and not to defend Europe. Britain could remain in it only if it could be restored to its original purpose.

Inevitably this policy will cause friction with America. There would be as much friction, or far more, if we were in the Russian strategic system and tried to leave it. We must stress that our policy is neither anti-American nor anti-Russian: it is against the H-bomb, and in favour of the human race.

What about our ties with the Commonwealth?

THE non-white Commonwealth nations already support the nuclear disarmament policy. Friendly discussion might well persuade the other members. But renouncing the H-bomb could never be such a shock to Commonwealth unity as Suez, which the Commonwealth survived.

Is this a policy of neutrality?

NEUTRAL countries are those which refrain from taking any stand which might offend a great power, either from principle like Switzerland, or from prudence like Finland and Austria. Such a role is impossible for a nation of Britain's importance. Britain should be uncommitted—not bound in advance to endorse either Russian or American policy. To use a still better term, Britain should be independent.

We should have many friends—in the Commonwealth, among the new nations of Asia and Africa, in Western Europe, and also among Russia's satellites, now welded to submission to Moscow by the cold war and the rival nuclear alliances, but likely to assert their independence in a more favourable political climate.

How can Britain help to secure real peace?

WE should say out loud that the human race is one, and the duty of preserving it comes before the desire to make any section of it Communist or non-Communist. We don't want Communism in Britain and make no secret of our opinion that people who adopt it will regret the day. But we oppose all efforts to stop them doing so by force. Communism is going to be in the world for a long time and we must live with it unless we prefer to die with it.

Nuclear war cannot bring victory to either Communism or democracy, but only catastrophe to us all. Recent utterances show that this truth has not penetrated the minds of any of the rulers of the nuclear powers. This in itself is a highly dangerous state of affairs. British statesmen must go on repeating it until leaders in other countries understand it, or give place to those who do.

But peaceful co-existence must be something more than the "co-existence" of two bears in a cage. Communist and non-Communist nations must be brought into positive co-operation. Humanity's first task is to end the shame of poverty, hunger, and preventable disease. If the new resources of science were mobilized to this end and not used to prepare for war, the job could be mastered in a generation. Britain should propose a joint world effort under the United Nations.

Politically, we should stand for peaceful settlement of all disputes; for a security pact and withdrawals of troops in Europe; for neutralization, an arms embargo, and respect for existing frontiers in the Middle East; for the entry of the real Chinese Government into the United Nations.

We should seek to strengthen the authority of the United Nations, and the gradual reduction of national armies till they can be merged into an international police force.

A renascent Britain can once again save herself by her exertions and, this time, the world by her example.

What you can do

- ★ Send us your name and address, and the names and addresses of anyone you know who supports the Campaign. Forms for this are available from the Office.
- ★ Send us a donation, and ask your friends to do the same. Funds are urgently needed.
- ★ Raise the issues at any organisation or church to which you belong, and get them to support the Campaign.
- ★ Write to the Prime Minister (Mr. Harold Macmillan, M.P. at 10 Downing Street, London, S.W.1), to the Foreign Secretary (Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, M.P., at the Foreign Office, London, S.W.1), to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, M.P.), to Mr. Aneurin Bevan, M.P., and to your own M.P., at the House of Commons, London, S.W.1, telling them how strongly you feel about nuclear weapons.
- ★ Write to your local newspaper and to the National Press.
- ★ Help to organise local activity in support of the Campaign. In many places we already have local Groups or Committees. The names and addresses of the Secretaries can be obtained from the Campaign Office. In other places where no Groups yet exist, help in setting one up will be welcome and every assistance will be given you.
- ★ Large public meetings are being arranged in many cities. Look out for the announcements.
- ★ Keep in touch by subscribing to the Campaign Monthly Bulletin. It costs 5/- a year.
- ★ Wear a badge showing the Campaign symbol. (price 6d from the Campaign Office).

CAMPAIGN FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

143 Fleet Street, London, E.C.4

Telephone: FLEet Street 4175

PRESIDENT: Earl Russell, OM, FRs.

VICE-PRESIDENT: J. B. Priestley

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: The Rev. Canon L. John Collins (Chairman), Ritchie Calder, C.B.E. (Vice-Chairman), Ted Bedford (Treasurer), Sir Richard Acland, Frank Beswick, M.P., James Cameron, Howard Davies, Michael Foot, Arthur Goss, Jacquetta Hawkes, Professor Nicholas Kemmer, Benn Levy, Kingsley Martin, The Rev. Dr. Donald Soper, A. J. P. Taylor.

ORGANISING SECRETARY: Mrs. Peggy Duff.
