

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VI, NO. 46

NOVEMBER 24, 1958



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

A Growing Pessimism About the Disarmament Talks

I must confess to a growing pessimism about the various disarmament talks now going on. I have begun to feel that they serve only to delude people into thinking that something is being done when in fact the arms race takes on new momentum. Here are some reasons for this dark view:

The Problem Grows Obsolete As They Palaver

1. *The Surprise Attack Talks:* The main reliance of both sides for a surprise attack will soon be the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile, which requires only 30 minutes to reach its target. Even if we had inspectors at each other's bases and politely allowed them to telephone before firing an ICBM, the warning time wouldn't make much difference. As for aerial inspection, the careful study of it in Seymour Melman's indispensable symposium, "*Inspection for Disarmament*" (Columbia Univ. Press) shows that the ICBM will make it obsolete. Unlike the bombing plane which requires large easily observed airfields, the ICBM needs only small underground bases as difficult to identify from the air as "discerning manhole covers from 50,000 feet." Once ICBM's have been mass produced and installed, prevention of surprise attack will become hopeless. Yet neither side is ready to make sufficient concession to win agreement on controls before that fatal stage is reached.

A Recipe for Perpetual Recrimination

2. *The Soviet Union and Inspection:* In the Geneva talks by the experts last summer, the Soviet spokesmen aroused misgivings by two proposals. One was that the 30-man teams which would be attached to the nuclear testing inspection posts be made up of nationals from the country which was being inspected, with "perhaps" one or two international representatives. The other was that a control agency be made up of equal representatives from East and West. Such a 50-50 control mechanism, with no neutral to break a tie, would create a built-in deadlock. Trouble would arise when a detection post registered a "rumble" and wanted to send a team for an on-the-spot look to determine whether an earthquake or an underground test had taken place. The Soviet approach could prevent inspection which both sides would trust. A control system of this kind would breed perpetual recrimination, and this explains why the Western representatives at the new Geneva talks want the controls spelled out before signing a treaty on test cessation. The Russians want disarmament but apparently not enough to accept effective inspection.

3. *The Gore Proposal:* Gore (D. Tenn.), the Senate's observer at the Geneva test talks, is back with a proposal which implies (prematurely) that the talks have already failed. He proposes a 3-year unilateral moratorium by the U. S. on big

tests but continued underground testing of small nuclear weapons. This proposal originates with former AEC Commissioner Thomas E. Murray, now consultant to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. His views are attractive to liberal members of the Committee. They are strong for public development of atomic power, but cheap atomic power depends on finding a market for the plutonium byproduct. Its only present use is for weapons. If the government will buy large quantities of plutonium for small nuclear weapons, then there is an economic basis for building dual purpose reactors which can produce public power—and plutonium—at reasonable prices. This linkage of power with weapons is characteristic of the liberal Democrats, who fall back on the arms race whenever confronted with a serious economic problem.

Holy (Limited Nuclear) War

Mr. Murray is an able engineer who has long believed that we already had too many large bombs and that their testing created a health hazard. He is also an amateur Catholic visionary, preaching (as in his speech here last Saturday night to the alumni of Catholic University) that some kinds of war are holy. He wants "Catholic thinkers" to take "the lead in the elaboration of the civilized tradition of warfare" which he equates with limited nuclear war. His proposal would cut off atmospheric pollution but speed up the arms race. Dr. Hans Bethe, who is on the President's Science Advisory Committee, called this "very dangerous" when he was before the Humphrey disarmament committee last April but censorship deleted his reasons.

As for the "civilized" character of limited nuclear war, we refer readers to Hanson W. Baldwin's conclusions after watching a trial performance in the so-called Exercise Sage Brush. "The biggest lesson," Mr. Baldwin wrote (*New York Times*, Dec. 5, 1955), "is that there probably can be no such thing as a limited or purely tactical nuclear war." He came back with an "apocalyptic vision" of what small nuclear weapons would have done in the 12 State area in those maneuvers.

Big Clubs Were A Deterrent, Too

4. *Soon Be Too Late to Trade:* Though our bases aboard will soon be obsolete, we refuse to trade them (as Moscow suggests) for controls which might still stifle ICBM development. Though reconnaissance by satellite will soon open all countries to observation from the air, the Russians refuse to trade aerial inspection (as Washington suggests) for arms control. Rigidity mark both sides. Like two red-eyed cave-men with big clubs, each is deterred for the time being from fear of the smashing blow the other could deliver. But neither has sense enough to relinquish hate for safety.

Gen. Trudeau Complains About the Public and Dr. Libby Offers A New Anti-Fallout Device

How to Make the Man-in-The-Cellar Less Nervous About World War III

The most wistful note of the week was struck by Lt. Gen. Arthur Trudeau, chief of research for the Army, in a speech at St. Louis. The Pentagon decided discreetly not to make text available but according to the Associated Press he deplored our lag in chemical warfare and blamed this on the public. "The greatest fly in the ointment," he said, choosing a rather unfortunate metaphor, "is the antipathy of the American people regarding chemical weapons." It must indeed be difficult for a conscientious scientist-General to understand why people should object more strongly to being poisoned or fried by chemical means than to being vaporized by an H-bomb or even pierced by a bullet. These irrational lay predilections create problems for the military expert. They are not, however, insuperable and the Chemical Warfare Corps may find helpful hints in the tactics of the Atomic Energy Commission. The AEC, confronted with similar fears about strontium-90 and other forms of radioactive fallout, launched a reassuring study some advertising genius named Operation Sunshine, thus equating the new poisons in the air with that stuff you go to Miami for in the winter-time. By methods no more far-fetched, beneficent associations might be linked with chemical warfare. Chemicals, after all, are the base of all medicines, and medicines are the base of health. If it is possible to offer the idea that fallout from bomb tests is no more dangerous than an extra ounce of fat, perhaps we might sell the idea that chemical warfare really was no different from an overdose of aspirin, and much more likely to cure what ails you.

What to Do When the Bombs Fall

The AEC's ingenuity in dealing with these childish fears on the part of the public was demonstrated by Dr. Willard F. Libby, its scientist member, on CBS "Face the Nation" last Sunday, Nov. 16. That very morning in the *Washington Post* its able science reporter, Edward Gamarekian, disclosed that radioactive fallout reached a new all-time high in many parts of the United States during July—in a few places, for a short period of time, as in Los Angeles, exceeding the maximum permissible limits. When Dr. Libby was asked about this, he said he thought it a good idea to have people aroused about fallout because then they could "plan to protect themselves in case of war." With the air of a man unwrapping a surprise, Dr. Libby said he had brought along "a principal instrument protecting against fallout." TV viewers all over

Delicacy in Journalism Note

The New York Times managed three days in succession to run a news story, a background personality sketch and an editorial about William H. Meyer, the first Democrat to be elected to Congress from Vermont in several generations without mentioning that he was active in the American Civil Liberties Union and campaigned for an end of nuclear tests, for banning the H-bomb and for recognition of Red China.

the country must have leaned forward in their chairs with expectation. "This," Dr. Libby declared, taking the instrument out of his pocket, "is an ordinary transistorized radio. Now, with this," he explained, "you can keep in touch with the central authorities and find out where the fallout is coming." The AEC, always forging ahead, was now trying to get manufacturers to build in a radiation meter "so that you would also be able to see how much fallout you had." Dr. Libby said this "plus fixing up your cellar" could save "ten million lives." We felt safer, just listening to him.

Afterwards we began to wonder. Our cellar, even if fixed up, would only be of use if far enough from the scene of a main attack not to be affected by nuclear blast and fire. Only cellars a distance of several hundred miles from main cities, air bases and other prime targets would be in this fortunate category. We wondered, too, about the "central authorities" on whose broadcasts we would have to depend. Could we be sure that they would survive unscathed? And continue to operate a communications network which would bring them data on fallout patterns and radioactive levels? Dr. Libby seemed to assume that the business of government would go on pretty much as usual, though dependent on facilities which might need a bit of repair work after a thermonuclear attack. We wondered, too, just what we would do even if we knew "where the fallout is coming" and how much fallout we already had. If we decided we had better stay down in the cellar a few days or perhaps even weeks, how and what would we eat? Of course if the corner grocer was still in business, and his stock was still edible, maybe we could reach him by short wave and arrange for a delivery. In the meantime that transistorized radio would be a great morale builder. While cowering in the cellar, wondering what had happened to the President, we could listen in on the baseball scores. Dr. Libby has cheered us up immensely.

Four Witch Hunt Cases, State and Federal, Argued in Supreme Court

Four contempt cases were being argued in the Supreme Court as we went to press this week. Lloyd Barenblatt's First Amendment appeal, supported by the American Civil Liberties Union, and a last minute brief amicus by the American Association of University Professors, challenges the House Un-American Activities Committee. Abram Flaxer's case grew out of his refusal to give the Senate Internal Security Committee the names and addresses of the 35,000 members of the United Public Workers union of which he was then President.

The other two appeals involve State agencies. David H. Scull, a Quaker printer in Arlington, Va., refused to answer questions put to him in a State legislative inquiry designed,

in the words of its chairman, to "bust the NAACP wide open." Willard Uphaus refused to hand over the guest records of his World Fellowship camp at Conway, N. H., and its correspondence with lecturers to that State's witch hunting Attorney General, Louis C. Wyman, who lost last year in the Sweezy case. When asked why he wanted the correspondence, Wyman replied the letters might have shown that Uphaus suggested that speakers advocate the overthrow of the government. The newest member of the Court, Mr. Justice Potter Stewart, thereupon asked, "But isn't it absolutely incredible? That isn't the way you plot revolution." Poor Mr. Eisenhower must have accidentally picked a liberal for the Supreme Court again.