

supported by fact or history. The credibility of this argument might be less strained without the additional burden of the U.S. having unilaterally used nuclear weapons in a first strike against a non-nuclear and virtually beaten nation. The question of whether or not a nation appears less dangerous when it credibly possesses both the Bomb and a demonstrated willingness to use it asymmetrically is best asked in the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

If we reject the idea that Truman was the biggest terrorist in history, and that he actually did drop the Bomb for entirely altruistic reasons, we are then left to speculate as to why his administration did not immediately pursue negotiations with the world powers to ensure that the atom bomb would never be produced or used again, with the obvious and inexpensive pledge to dismantle our capability in return for the world's nations' agreement to never attempt to build one of their own. The Cold War might have ended then and there, but the opportunity was rejected forever. Subsequent administrations and Congress could have refused to pursue development of the super H-Bomb, as the Russians had appealed to us to not develop it because they would be compelled to reciprocate.

The Soviet Stockholm petition proposed a ban on all nuclear weapons but was secretly laughed at in Washington, and answered with the Korean War in 1950. A test ban proposal was ignored and 'Operation Gerald' proceeded in 1952; a young Andrei Sakharov invented the "Slayka" (layered pastry) design in 1953, which made the USSR's own Hydrogen Bomb a deliverable device, which made him the 'father' of the Soviet Bomb. Later, his conscience drove him insane. Lucky for us, Edward Teller, 'father' of the U.S. Hydrogen Bomb was immune from being driven insane because he was already there and quite mad.

Throughout many Presidential administrations, the number and variety of U.S. weapons systems was multiplied. It was the Eisenhower administration that developed the idea of commercial nuclear electrical power. They did so to counter the Stockholm petition and the Soviet overtures to disarm. It is no coincidence that the power reactors chosen were the light-water design that required enriched fuel and used a metallic fuel rod assembly. Heavy-water reactors do not require enriched fuel, whereas enrichment technology required for light-water reactors can also be used to enrich uranium for bombs. The choice of the metallic fuel assembly over ceramic fuel assembly leaves an easily recoverable source of plutonium for the production of atomic bombs, as we have not pursued breeder reactors in the U.S.

The problem is, of course, that the cost of nuclear power had to be fabricated in order to divert international opinion to believing the U.S. was developing peaceful uses of nuclear power. This was not difficult since the nuclear industry was new and unprecedented, and shrouded in secrecy. The initiative to misstate the true costs of nuclear power came from the highest executive offices. Eisenhower himself addressed the UN in 1953, stating the intention of developing commercial power in order to counter the Soviet move for disarmament — which is why the current Iranian claim to pursue commercial nuclear power is discounted as a lie by the U.S.; a lie we fabricated more than half a century ago.

The historical record will bear analysis that the USA has, at every opportunity to defuse the proliferation of WMD, done the opposite and has sought nuclear proliferation and promotion of the arms race. The U.S. pioneered development of MRV warheads, the Neutron Bomb, the nuclear submarine launch platform, the cruise missile and ABM systems. At the same time, we pursued development and stockpiled vast arsenals of chemical and biologic weapons, delivery systems, and stealth or first-strike technologies, and conducted more than 1,000 atomic and H-bomb tests in the atmosphere and underground, conducted animal and human tests of biologic weapons, and conducted an aggressive policy of stationing U.S. military forces in hundreds of 'forward' bases in foreign countries. In the meantime, the U.S. government carried out domestic surveillance, counter-intelligence operations, disruption, harassment, disinformation and propaganda campaigns against popular anti-war and anti-nuclear movements.

The U.S. armed, equipped and provided intelligence as well as biological weapons to Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq, and despite knowledge of his use of chemical weapons, made no formal accusation against him for more than a decade. That makes us complicit in everything he did. The least we could have done was issue a condemnation of his regime and call for a UN investigation, if just for show.

Given all this, it is understandable that the rest of the world does not believe the American position on disarmament or nonproliferation is altruistically motivated. It is clear to the world that the position of the U.S. is cynically employed to extend U.S. hegemony over the interests of other nations. The war in Iraq (and threat of war against Iran) is about oil, and everybody knows it.

The additional development of a preemptive war to allegedly prevent another nation from developing a deterrent capability will certainly not transform the effect of deterrence into one that favors nonproliferation. The invasion of Iraq demonstrated that deterrence is only effective in proportion to the credibility of the weapons systems to inflict casualties. To believe that the threat of American invasion because of the uncompleted intent to acquire weapons of mass destruction will favor further disarmament or nonproliferation is counterintuitive. The demonstration of the politics made by the preemptive and aggressive war against Iraq is provocation for all nations to arm quickly and secretly, and to never disarm under any condition. To believe otherwise is what I like to call the Big Crazy because



ROBERT ARNESON

any other mental illness appears positively sane in comparison. It is 'Big Crazy' to say that preemptive war can have any other effect than intensifying the international political will to build more prolific and more lethal weapons systems.

In the 1970s, nuclear powers recognized that a world where every country possesses nuclear weapons of either their own manufacture or as agents of existing nuclear powers, endangers the security of all nations. That proliferation is a recipe to escalate any regional conflict into a global thermonuclear exchange. In the event the same fears that motivated us to build the Bomb are not diminished by our preemptive war, our withdrawal from the ABM Treaty, our failure to disarm or to stop building weapons, or our asymmetrical first use of nuclear bombs — it is safe to conclude that every nation that is capable of building or possessing nuclear weapons now has a greater number of people who passionately wish to acquire them or more of them.

You cannot force the world to disarm by force of arms through preemptive war unless you intend to wage war upon the world as Hitler did. Even if you could, what would distinguish your altruism from simple imperialistic conquest when the tactics and outcomes are indistinguishable?

You cannot have disarmament and deterrence at the same time. The only legitimate encouragement of nonproliferation is an international framework of agreement to not build or maintain arsenals of either nuclear, chemical or biologic weapons in any country to guarantee security through peace not deterrence. That we devote ourselves to a genuine elimination of all war forever and an eternal peace between nations.

Coupled with this is the reality that all weapons systems and armies exist in defiance of the peace, which means we must renounce the use of military force to settle international disputes. We must end world hostilities and institute a phased and balanced reduction and elimination of all weapons and military forces to a reasonable level for a civil constabulary.

The 20th century witnessed the outcome of nations devoting their economies to the alternative of peace; the military resolution of political and ideological conflicts between nations. I was under the naïve assumption that the costs of military conflicts had already been demonstrated to be so inflated by the technologies of war that they were accepted by all powers as too great to justify the imagined benefits. That aggressive war was outlawed and that the United Nations' reason for being is to oppose the waging of aggressive war by sanctioning actions against it. The preemptive invasion of Iraq is a great step away from this principle, and has so destabilized the world that only the foolish could think of the world as a safer place.

We must withdraw from the Middle East and ensure that the sovereignty of existing nations is not violated. Close our foreign military bases and reduce the number of warships and overflights of warplanes. Civil secular government by majority rule is not that difficult to establish if imperial powers are not after other nations' resources. Allow national self-determination to flower, and the divisions of resources to benefit peoples of nations and the world peacefully and fairly through the ballot.

We can make a world of expanding human rights and prosperity where life is affirmed and where trade between nations increases their mutual welfare and the better angels of our natures prevail.

Peace has never come through the threat of war, nuclear or otherwise. The road to peace bears a cost, but I believe it will be cheaper than the alternative of continuously escalating hostility to the ultimate end we are technologically capable of.

All people now need to devote their lives to manufacturing peace. The only body that can facilitate this is a congress of nations such as the UN should be, empowered to adjudicate grievances between nations effectively enough to restrain the large-scale violation of the peace. At the same time, it is also necessary to provide a council capable of inspections as well as being able to encourage multilateral dismantling of the implements of war and the reduction in size of military forces. What purpose, after all, can the maintenance of militaries and proliferation of weapons systems serve if not to threaten the peace? The price for an eternity of peace has been paid by the hundreds of millions of casualties in the last century; this century should not discard their sacrifice. We must step away from the brink of renewed world wars.

If you can speak, do not draw breath but to speak for peace. If you can write, write letters, speeches, books and articles for peace. Write your Congresspeople. If you can travel, go to Washington, D.C. and seek out your representatives, go to the next World Social Forum, attend peace rallies. Go to Hiroshima and Nagasaki. If you feel comfortable lying down in front of trucks carrying bombs or munitions, do it! I don't know what you can do, but you have to start now in your heart to live your life for peace. You will not find out what can be done if you do not search for the answers. Do not let the grim lessons of the 20th century die ignominiously in a bloodbath of millenarian stupidity.

J. R. S. lives on the North Oregon Coast.



## BOMB NOTES:

The creation and use of the Atomic Bomb was fundamentally undemocratically decided under the duress and condition of war. We created it under the cover of secrecy because if the world found out what we were undertaking, they would emulate. This move to absolute secrecy in matters of international political relationships is dictatorial and counter to democracy, as all monarchies are fundamentally secret deliberations closed to the direction of the people except by the most extreme actions. The national security state is not just counter and antagonistic to the democratic constitution of a republic, it is the death of the democratic republic. Those involved in the secretive world of governing and directing the construction and maintenance of the nuclear arsenal have become the new priesthood of the world. We have never surrendered the sovereignty of the people over the direction of our society. It was usurped and it is up to us to recapture it from the monsters who would conceive of us as acceptable losses in a "winnable" nuclear war.

At the close of World War 2, the only threat to world peace was admitted by Leo Szilard: "Perhaps the greatest danger that faces us now is the probability that our 'demonstration' of the bomb will precipitate a race in the production of these devices between the U.S. and the USSR."

By the middle of 1980, the number of nuclear warheads manufactured on each side had reached 95,000, a truly astoundingly-insane large number.

By the close of 1961, the USA fielded five Polaris 1 nuclear submarines, each with 16 nuclear missiles of 12NM range, and placed missiles in Turkey and who knew where else on aggressive forward U.S. military around the world. In 1963, we fielded another five Polaris 2 nuclear submarines armed with 16 missiles of 1500NM range, and followed that closely in 1964 with the introduction of the Polaris 3 nuclear submarine that the A-3 missile that had three maneuverable reentry warhead vehicles apiece. That was succeeded by the Poseidon missile that had a 2800NM range, and the 1974 Ohio Class ballistic missile submarine that carried 24 missiles with 10 MRV, and not to rest there, the Trident 1 and Trident 2 nuclear submarines carried the Trident missile with a range of over 4000NM and eight MRV per warhead of at least 100 KT power. Every one of these developments was launched, not to maintain parity with our Cold War adversaries, but to try and recapture the asymmetrical advantage of force that unilateral possession of the Bomb first offered the U.S. in 1945.

~ J. R. S.

**Old Town Framing Co.**

1287 COMMERCIAL ST.  
ASTORIA 325-5221