



DISARMAMENT AND SOVIET - AMERICAN RELATIONS

Article by Cyrus Eaton  
Published in February, 1961, Issue  
of International Affairs Magazine  
Moscow, U. S. S. R.







The most urgent and necessary task that confronts mankind today is general and complete disarmament.

In this article, from the viewpoint of an American capitalist and industrialist, I should like to make a brief presentation of the overpowering reasons that persuade me to this unshakeable belief. After weighing the hazards of continuing the arms race against the advantages and risks of disarmament, and examining some of the existing obstacles to disarmament, I should then like to outline one or two of the more promising, immediately possible steps toward disarmament.

#### Continuation of Cold War Will Seal Doom of Mankind

If the cold war goes on, with its feverish preparations for nuclear conflict, offensive or defensive, the doom of mankind appears to be sealed. This is the conviction of informed people of both East and West, and nowhere have the supporting arguments been more clearly and forcefully expressed than in the paper on "The Danger of the Lasting Armament Race," delivered by Academician I. E. Tamm, one of the highly distinguished group of Soviet scientists who participated in the recent Sixth Pugwash Conference of International Scientists in Moscow.

As Professor Tamm points out, one hydrogen bomb is capable of annihilating one million people. At the present stage of nuclear armament, the unleashing of war between powers possessing such weapons must inevitably lead to the mutual destruction of all participants.

Local disputes over boundaries or other relatively unimportant questions can result in local wars among small nations that grow into all-out nuclear conflicts if the big powers join in and take sides. The vast networks of early warning







systems and push-button war posts, with their numerous personnel, present mortal peril from mere human error. Under the law of probability, Professor Tamm flatly predicts that this elaborate and complicated machinery, unless disbanded, is bound to lead to an accident, from a mistaken warning or even a meteorite, that will subject humanity to indescribable disaster and grief. With new nations joining the nuclear club unless disarmament agreements are promptly concluded, the probability of the final human calamity will rapidly multiply.

The advantages of abandoning the arms race seem obvious. Complete and universal extermination is assured unless humanity turns aside from the present folly. At the same time, every ethical principle to which mankind has subscribed down the centuries is more overwhelmingly on the side of disarmament than ever, in this fifteenth year since the ghastly destructive power of even the first primitive atom bombs was demonstrated.

#### Disarmament Would Mean Untold Potential Benefits to Mankind

If lofty ethical considerations and terrifying prospects of destruction are not reasons enough, there is the immense economic advantage that would accrue to every country on earth if the arms race could be terminated. Even the most unimaginative mind must recognize the untold potential benefits to all mankind from the equivalent in trade and commerce of the \$1,000 million the world is now wasting on armaments each year.

For American industrialists, as for all American citizens, I can categorically state that munitions orders bring more burdens by way of taxation than benefits by way of profits. The existence of an economic recession in the United States today, at a time when defense spending by the government has reached an all-time peak, makes this abundantly clear.







Mutual Distrust among Nations is Main Inhibiting Factor

If, as I believe, most of the world wants disarmament, why has an effective treaty not been drawn up and adopted? The main inhibiting factor is mutual distrust among nations. In the present emotional climate of the world, there are many who unfortunately feel that the advantages of disarmament are outweighed by its risks to what has come to be called national security.

From my own long and friendly contacts with the Soviet people and their leaders, and from my firsthand acquaintance with the Soviet Union, I am convinced of the sincere desire of the Soviet government and public for friendship and understanding with the United States. While my feeling is shared by an increasing number of Americans, realism compels me to admit that not all of my countrymen have yet been persuaded to this point of view.

The chief problem in the United States, then, is the education of public opinion. The solution to this problem cannot be reached, moreover, until the American media of mass information -- the daily press, weekly and monthly magazines, radio, television and moving pictures -- are induced to accept the sincerity of Soviet intentions. In the United States, these agencies of information are privately owned by widely separated interests, so that a change in their individual attitudes requires a broad major effort.

U.S. and Soviet Groups Must Work Equally for Atmosphere of Trust

On the one hand, the thousands of American societies and committees that have organized for the purpose of promoting disarmament and friendly Soviet-American relations must find a way to work together. They must strive to speak with a common voice that will make itself heard throughout the land.

On the other hand, all segments of the Soviet Union, political, scientific,







industrial and cultural, need to dedicate themselves to creating the atmosphere of trust that will remove fear of disarmament from the American mind. By word as by deed, they should concentrate on getting their message across to every level of American life.

The Soviets could make a decisive impression on the United States and the rest of the world by throwing their country open to visitations. The technological revolution of the past twenty years in the USA and the USSR, as well as other leading industrial countries, has been stupendous, and the scientists of all these nations are equally familiar with the underlying facts of the technological advances. As a recognized leader in technological progress in all fields, the Soviet Union has no reason for concern over secrecy.

Both U. S. and USSR Must Observe Status Quo in Other Nations

Both the United States and the Soviet Union need to make it plain to each other that neither aims to change existing political borders or economic and political systems of other smaller countries. Short of nuclear war, neither the USA nor the USSR possesses the power or persuasion to interfere in the internal problems of other nations without seriously exacerbating the cold war.

On the positive side, Soviet Premier Khrushchev has come forward with constructive and concrete proposals for complete and general disarmament several times, most recently at the current session of the United Nations General Assembly in New York. While the United States has not yet countered with sweeping peace proposals of its own, the new Democratic Administration **that will** take office in January gives indications of addressing itself seriously to this all-important task. A hopeful note can be found in the imminent retirement of some of the old guard at the Atomic Energy Commission, the Pentagon and the State Department, who have teamed with







a few highly vocal American scientists to urge increased armaments at every turn during the eight years of the outgoing Republican Government.

As a first step, the United States ought to come quickly back to the Geneva Conference with a workable and acceptable plan for discontinuing nuclear weapons tests. In the USA-USSR-UK talks that have been dragging on in Geneva for more than two years, the United States has been insisting on onerous conditions that even her most friendly western allies regard as impossible. If the United States will abandon the illusory notion of 100% foolproof detection, while the Soviet Union yields on inspection, the resultant agreement can provide the threshold for the needed negotiations on general and complete disarmament.

Time for Eastern and Western Industrialists to Take Hand in Disarmament

Another most promising approach was suggested by Premier Khrushchev at his luncheon with American and Canadian industrial leaders in New York on September 26, 1960. This was for industrialists of east and west, as well as journalists, lawyers and other public leaders outside of actual government itself, to join in working out a draft agreement on disarmament, to submit to all governments for discussion and consideration. For his part, Premier Khrushchev expressed willingness to meet with such a group and give his considered views on the product of their collaboration. Could other heads of government afford to do less?

I agree heartily with Premier Khrushchev that such joint action would help to solve the problems that are today dividing us. And I strongly echo his concluding sentiment that this will be conducive to the establishment of friendly relations among all countries, irrespective of the fact that one side is capitalist and the other communist, because, as he pointed out, "people all over the world, whatever country they may live in, want to live in peace and prosperity."