

GREAT DECISIONS

**Top 7
Can the Bomb Be Curbed?**

THE PROBLEM

Disarmament is not a new or revolutionary idea.

The Old Testament prophet Isaiah dreamed of a day when peoples would "... beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks..." Limitations on armaments, tried for centuries, have been written into numerous peace treaties and debated in dozens of disarmament conferences.

This year the control of armaments seems more difficult — and more important — than ever before. The mushroom cloud of the atom bomb hangs threateningly over the whole human race.

Every year tens of billions of dollars are spent for arms that could be spent for peace. Big and small nations urge disarmament. Russia and the U.S., and allies like Britain and France offer their proposals. India and other uncommitted countries suggest compromises.

Yet there is no agreement. The arms race continues and weapons become more deadly.

Where is the arms race leading? Is an all-out nuclear war possible? Could an atomic war destroy civilization? Could any nation "win"? Would disarmament prevent World War III? What are the chances of agreement on arms control?

Here are the cold facts on modern weapons and the choices the world faces in 1956... arms limits, bans on nuclear weapons, inspection systems. What should — or can — the U.S. do about disarmament in 1956?

Why Disarmament?

If World War III breaks out, could it be limited to conventional weapons... the bullets and TNT of World War II (except for the last two months) and the Korean War?

Would either side accept defeat by conventional arms... before taking up atomic and hydrogen weapons? The experts differ on these questions. Poison gas was successfully outlawed by international agreement. But wouldn't the prize in the next war be survival itself?

One clue is the kind of war the military leaders expect. Are Western armies preparing for an "old fashioned war" or an all-out atomic war? U.S. General Alfred Gruenther, commander of the West's NATO forces in Europe, said in June, 1954, "We visualize the use of atomic bombs in support of our ground troops. We also visualize the use of atomic bombs on targets in enemy territory. (If war) does take place our minds are clear that we must and shall use every weapon in our arsenal."

Is this the philosophy behind the streamlined "new look" of the U.S. armed forces... small, mobile units around the world, equipped with atomic cannon and other modern weapons... backed up by the power of massive retaliation from the air?

The U.S. Department of Defense recently announced we will use all available weapons even in a small local war.

If this is the U.S. military philosophy, how do we stand in terms of manpower and armaments?

How Strong Are We?

Military secrets are the best-kept secrets in the world. Even so, there are fairly reliable estimates of the relative military strength of East and West.

In Europe the estimates are that population totals 400,000,000 in the NATO countries, 300,000,000 in the communist bloc; combat divisions for NATO, 50, Communist, 260; reserve divisions, NATO 50, communist 170 (a Western division contains nearly twice as many men, more than twice the vehicles and slightly greater firepower than the communist); combat aircraft, NATO 6,000, communist 20,000.

The United States has an additional 20,000 planes in reserve, with emphasis on long-range, heavy bombers. Russia seems to be catching up with such bombers.

Russian aircraft production of 15,000 planes per year surpasses the U.S. 9,000 per year. Atomic weapons production in the U.S. is estimated at 30,000 for all types of atomic devices, and Russia's at 10,000.

Although estimates on atomic stockpiles are "educated guesswork," it is fairly certain that both Russia and the U.S. have reached the "saturation point." Each has enough in stock to destroy the other completely.

IS AN ATOM WAR "TOTAL" WAR?

The "Blockbusters" of World War II used one or two tons of TNT high explosive to level a city block. The first atomic bomb used in combat was equal to 20,000 tons of TNT and destroyed everything within a mile radius from "ground zero," the center of the explosion.

The first hydrogen bomb, tested by the U.S. in 1953, was equivalent to 15,000,000 tons of TNT and destroyed everything in a radius of four to five miles.

In June, 1955, the U.S. exploded an entirely new kind of atomic weapon. It works in three stages. First an atomic bomb triggers a hydrogen bomb, which, in turn, sets off a super atom bomb. The power is estimated between 20,000,000 and 40,000,000 tons of TNT... more than the total power of all bombs ever dropped in history.

The experts say there is no limit to how powerful a nuclear weapon can be. The bigger the bomb, the greater effect of radiation. Invisible radioactive particles in the air linger and drift with the winds... could destroy life in hundreds of thousands of square miles.

What does this all mean in terms of "total" war? How many atomic bombs would it take to bring the U.S. to her knees? Or Russia? How close are we to "mutual suicide"?

Twenty-five hydrogen bombs, dropped on the 25 largest U.S. cities, would destroy 20 per cent of our population. The same number dropped on Russia's 25 largest cities would destroy 10 per cent of her population.

Ten hydrogen bombs dropped on the 10 major U.S. industrial centers would destroy 82 per cent of our total iron capacity, 77 per cent of our coke and 73 per cent of our steel capacity. The same number dropped on Rus-

sia's centers would destroy 75 per cent of her iron and steel producing capacity.

Is There Any Defense?

What about our radar net in the Arctic? Our early warning devices? Could the U.S. prevent any sizable number of enemy atom bombers from reaching their targets? If less than a dozen bombers could paralyze U.S. war effort, what kind of defenses do we need? What kind do we have?

The chairman of the joint committee on atomic energy has said, "At best—and this is very optimistic—we might intercept as many as one out of every four Soviet bombers" (25 per cent effective).

The air defense command says 90 per cent effective might not be good enough to guarantee national survival.

WHAT ABOUT FUTURE WEAPONS?

Bigger and more powerful hydrogen and atomic bombs are not the ultimate, say the scientists. The important thing is to get an effective bomb to its target... in spite of defenses.

One "super weapon" of the future is an atomic weapon that does not depend on airplanes for delivery... a guided missile directed by remote control... an intercontinental rocket that will travel high above the earth and drop on its target a half hour later, without warning—a weapon against which there is no conceivable defense.

The U.S. has a guided missile with an admitted range of 200 miles, Russia is known to be testing an 800-mile missile. U.S. Sen. Henry Jackson reported that the Russians may already have a 1,500-mile guided missile. And the missile with a 5,000-mile range is only five years away, according to Dr. Werner von Braun, director of the U.S. guided missile division at Redstone Arsenal, Ala.

What effect will this have on Western defenses in Europe? Will 50 or 100 divisions save London, Paris or New York City?

And another super weapon already on the drawing boards is the "orbiter," a man-made moon revolving around the earth at 1,075 miles altitude, traveling in its own orbit.

Guided missiles would be carried to this platform by space ship and fired at any target on earth with faultless accuracy. The U.S. has announced we will launch a miniature earth satellite, 21 inches in diameter, during 1957-58.

CAN THE WORLD AFFORD ANOTHER GLOBEL WAR?

"I now put it to you that the words 'win' or 'lose' no longer apply to contests between nations which have nuclear power of any magnitude... Man will have it in his power in the future to destroy himself and every living thing on this planet..."

Our aim must be to prevent war; the prospect of winning or losing is not a profitable subject... British Field Marshal Lord Montgomery of Alamein, October, 1955.

Would another world war probably be a nuclear war? If World War II could be limited to conventional weapons, what would the U.S. (and our allies) have to do to defeat Russia? Would we build larger armies... speed up airplane production? Could we afford that?

Russia leads in manpower; the West in atomic weapons. Has

this balance kept peace so far? Might Russia launch a war once she catches up with the West in atomic weapons... or surpasses in guided missiles? Should the U.S. consider a "surprise" attack or "preventive" war against Russia before we lose our atomic lead?

Would there be any way to prevent Russian "massive retaliation"? Could either side win? **Is the West Prepared?**

Is there any reason why Western military strength in Europe—in proportion to population—is weaker than that of the communist countries? Is it because the West is not "militaristic"... because Western European countries do not take the Russian threat seriously... because they cannot afford larger armies?

What about the six U.S. divisions in Europe... are they important for the defense of Europe? Should we keep more or less troops there? Is atomic superiority the only important military advantage the West has? Can we keep this edge?

If communist armies attack with conventional weapons, should the West be the first to use atomic weapons? Could we fight any other kind of war in Europe? Is there danger a small "local" war might break out into global war?

What about weak Western defenses in the Middle East, South East Asia and the Far East? Is the West prepared for any kind of war anywhere?

Is Arms Control Necessary?

In your opinion will the armament race necessarily end in war? What are the alternatives? ... Would some kind of agreement make war less likely? Are there other ways to reduce tension and keep peace? Which should come first... arms control or reducing tension?

IS DISARMAMENT POSSIBLE?

At the beginning of last year, after 10 years of futile discussions, East and West seemed no closer to agreement on disarmament.

Details of the U.S. and Russian proposals in the early part of 1955 follow:

The West wanted, as the first step, to set up a foolproof inspection system in both the U.S. and Russia, with U.S. teams free to go anywhere in Russia and Russian teams free in the U.S.; second step, reduce armed forces of the great powers to fixed ceilings as soon as the inspection system was operating; third, to ban atomic weapons; and fourth, to enforce the system with an international control authority.

Russia wanted, regarding the first step, inspection which would come later following a "freeze" on all armies at the Jan. 1, 1955 level and destruction of all atomic weapons.

Regarding reduction of armed forces, Russia proposed an "across the board" cut of one-third in armed forces, followed by a ban on the manufacture and use of nuclear weapons.

Concerning the international control authority, Russia wanted the UN Security Council to have the final say on enforcement. Russia has a veto there, as do the U.S., Britain, France and nationalist China. Such a plan, said Western spokesmen, would allow Russia to hamstring disarmament progress any time, simply by the veto. Russia also wanted the inspection teams to have only limited access and to be subject to group control.

A new Russian proposal including several important concessions was received May 10, 1955 by the UN Disarmament Subcommittee in London. Basically, it proposed that inspection teams be limited to big ports, railway junctions, main roads and airports during the first year with further concessions to be made the second year.

The Russians also accepted ceilings proposed by the West on armed forces, accepted part of the Western proposal on banning atomic weapons, and accepted the idea of disarmament "in stages."

The West's chief objection to the Russian compromise plan was on inspection and control. The West wanted an independent control organ, complete freedom of movement for inspectors, and a control organ not subject to the Russian veto, in the Security Council.

At The Summit
President Eisenhower made his dramatic proposal for "open skies" at the Big Four Summit conference in Geneva in July, 1955. The new plan proposed that the U.S. and Russia trade military blueprints and allow each to take aerial photographs of the other.

The Russians did not react immediately to the president's open skies plan, but promised to study it. In August, the U.S. suggested that the proposal could be combined with the Russian plan to station ground inspectors at key points. **D i s a r m a m e n t**

would still proceed in steps or stages.

The Russian answer, which came Feb. 1, 1956, as a personal letter from Russian Premier Bulganin to Eisenhower, said "Open skies would create fear and suspicion instead of mutual trust."

New U.S. Policy

The "open skies" plan, some said, was a new U.S. approach to disarmament, putting emphasis on inspection instead of arms control.

Harold E. Stassen, the president's special assistant on disarmament, declared the U.S. has reservations about all previous plans. It is impossible, he explained, to detect atomic materials even if inspectors are allowed to roam over every square mile. Atomic stockpiles can be buried deep in the ground and shielded with lead.

The important thing is to watch methods of delivery... airports, rail junctions, seaports. Russia seemed to take the same stand.

Latest U. S. Proposals

Bulganin later proposed a 20-year friendship treaty, which President Eisenhower declined as unnecessary in view of the obligations both countries have under the UN Charter.

Then, Mar. 1, 1956, the president offered a new concession. If Russia would agree to the open skies plan, along with limited inspection at key points, the U.S. would agree to freezing all nuclear weapons at present levels.

The president's letter also agreed to inspection of U.S. overseas bases and to gradual cutbacks in "major types of armament" such as tanks, jet planes and rockets.

WHAT ARE OUR CHOICES?

Is agreement on arms control possible? What kind of disarmament would work? Is it necessary to cut both arms and manpower to keep peace? Which, if either, is more important? Would any arms agreement have any value without mutual inspection?

Can we expect Russia to accept a freeze on manufacture of atomic weapons when our stockpiles are so much larger than theirs? Why are the suspicions of our open skies proposal? Why are we suspicious of Russian disarmament proposals? Will any kind of agreement work without mutual trust? Can the U.S. and Russia reach a workable compromise? Can they trust each other?

Should the U.S. pay the price? Do we want Russian observers inspecting our military installations? Can we afford to stop making atomic weapons? If the Russians agree to the President's March 1 proposal, can we be sure that they will also stop making atomic weapons? What effect would arms control... and inspection... have on our overseas bases?

Is there any alternative? Should other steps be taken to reduce tensions between East and West? What are some possibilities? If not a foolproof plan, then should we be satisfied with a workable plan?

If armaments can be cut, what should be done with the money saved? Would a cut in the military budget threaten U.S. prosperity? Should nuclear tests be stopped, or should they be continued... perhaps under UN sponsorship? Russia and India claim that nuclear tests produce radiation which endangers life everywhere.

What is your opinion?

YOUR OPINION COUNTS

The UN subcommittee on disarmament may meet through 1956 trying to work out an acceptable disarmament plan. In this election year, the question of military policy is already a campaign issue. These are questions the American people may be called upon to decide.

Whatever conclusions you have reached, remember that in a democracy, your opinion counts.

The Great Decisions committee will receive letters, or the ballots included in the fact sheets, to be tabulated and the results forwarded to the U.S. Department of State and to our congressional representatives.

Comments should be addressed to Great Decisions, care Don Hansen, Franklin building, Medford, chairman of the Great Decisions committee.

The material above is a condensation of the Great Decisions fact sheets prepared for use by discussion groups and others interested.

REBELS KILL 12

Algiers, Algeria — (U.P.) — Nationalist rebels killed 12 soldiers, wounded 10 and kidnaped 10 others when they ambushed a French army unit in the Tiemcen mountains of Western Algeria, the French army announced Saturday. The army said rebel losses were "high" but gave no other details.

Use Tribune Want Ads

Sunday, May 6, 1956

MEDFORD (OREGON) MAH. TRIBUNE—FIVE

State Emergency Board Authorizes Building

Salem — (U.P.) — A new building in Corvallis consolidating forest products and forest management laboratories was authorized Friday by the State Em-

ergency Board.

Cost of the structure will be \$475,000. Money will come from the forest severance tax. At present the forest products lab is on the Oregon State College campus and the management lab is in Salem.

EXAMS SCHEDULED

Radio operator examinations will be held at Klamath Union High School in Klamath Falls, Saturday, May 19.

Dead line Sunday Classified is at noon Saturday; 10 a.m. Monday for Monday; other days 5:30 previous day.

Hotpoint Hotpoint Hotpoint

RESERVE FRIDAY, MAY 18th!

**DON'T MISS
Hotpoint's
"Hawaiian
Holiday"
COME IN NOW
and REGISTER..**



**FREE THIS
NEW
1956**

Hotpoint ELECTRIC

**RANGE TO BE GIVEN
AWAY**

At the conclusion of our "HAWAIIAN HOLIDAY" ...
Your choice of Classic White or Any of Five Colortones

IT'S NEW ... living room

COLOR

comes to your kitchen



in the beautiful new

COLORTONE

Hotpoint

**ELECTRIC
RANGES**

5 DECORATOR COLORS

Coral Pink • Sunburst Yellow • Seafoam Blue • Meadow Green • Woodland Brown • and Classic White.

cooks everything in the
book... automatically

... and it's faster
than gas too!

New Super-Matic Calrod* for completely automatic cooking • automatic deep-well cooker • automatic oven • Custom Cooker and Server • automatic french fryer • Calrod golden griddle optional now or later. You get all this and color, too.

RETAIL PRICE
\$399⁹⁵

City Appliance, Inc.

"JACKSON COUNTY'S EXCLUSIVE HOTPOINT DEALER"

127 North Central Avenue
Medford, Ore. - Phone 3-5306

OPEN WED.
EVES. 'TIL 9

137 East Main Street
Ashland, Ore. - Phone 9-5831

Hotpoint Hotpoint Hotpoint

If you're saving for your family's future...



Where you save does make a difference

Saving now makes a difference to your family's future. There's a difference where you save, too. Saving in an insured Savings and Loan Association means important advantages. Excellent returns from your money is one advantage.

Another is efficient service from men who know how to make your dollars work harder for you.

Your money is safe because in insured Associations your savings are protected by sound management and substantial reserves. They are insured up to \$10,000 by the FSLIC—an agency of the U. S. Government.

These are the reasons why Americans are putting more of their savings account dollars into insured Savings and Loan Associations than anywhere else!



This sign identifies us as a member of The Savings and Loan Foundation Inc., a nationwide organization of insured Savings and Loan, Building and Loan and Homestead Association which sponsors this message in Life, The Saturday Evening Post and U. S. News and World Report.

Investments Made by the 10th of the Month Earn Dividends as of the 1st



FIRST FEDERAL

Savings & Loan Assn. of Medford

27 North Holly R. F. Kyle, President



Vote For
Margaret Von Lubken

DELEGATE AT LARGE
REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

State Vice Chairman
Republican State Central
Committee of Oregon

(Paid Political Adv.)