

WE ASKED THE LEADERS

Nuclear weapons for Canada was the subject of heated debate in the House of Commons in September. Last month several hundred students marched on Ottawa to express their disfavor for nuclear arms in Canada. A large number of Nobel prize-winning scientists just last week petitioned the United Nations for complete disarmament.

Politically and socially, what is the significance of the "peace movement?" Are the students of Canada deeply involved? What effect, if any, are they having? What stand does science take on nuclear disarmament, and what about the moral responsibility of the scientists who work on nuclear weapons research?

These are some of the questions that Feature writers Jennifer Bolch and Angela Sawchuk battled about with representatives of campus Liberals, Conservatives, New Democrats, CU CND, Students' Council and the political science department over gallons of coffee at a special press conference.

Jennifer is a transfer student (political science) from Berkeley California. Angela is in third year chemistry.



NO ALTERNATIVE... Al Baker

REPRESENTATIVES' VIEWS

by Jennifer Bolch

"Unilateral disarmament is unilateral suicide," claimed Lawrence Chapman, representative of the Conservative Club on campus, at a recent press conference on the peace movement in Canada. Carefully pointing out that he was not necessarily speaking for the Conservatives, Chapman explained that he was in favor of nuclear weapons for Canada, "if all else fails, and only for defence purposes of course."

CUCND representative Dan DeVlieger pointed out that

FIGHT TO THE DEATH

every nation wants nuclear arms "only for defence purposes." But he claimed that if smaller countries had access to the weapons, they would be tempted to use them for smaller, personal objectives. Also DeVlieger stated that the honourable tradition of fighting to the death for what one believes is no longer reasonable, since it would involve the death of the entire human race.

Keith Conrad of the campus Liberals agreed, explaining that he supported President Kennedy's policy of maintaining the status quo in the nuclear club.

Dr. Scott, professor of physics and representative of the Edmonton Committee for the Control of Radiation Hazards, discussed the implications of disarmament for science. He pointed out the viewpoint of many—that scientists cannot be held

responsible for the use which people make of their work.

All present credited the mass media with a large portion of the general public ignorance and mistrust of the peace movement. It was pointed out that a Hiroshima Day Peace March down Jasper Avenue involving over 500 people was com-

STARTLING STUDENTS

pletely ignored by Edmonton's only daily paper.

Opening with the startling, if true statement that the Students' Union has no political opinions, Peter Hyndman, Student Council



NO STEREOTYPE... Dr. D. B. Scott

president, claimed that the real battle between East and West is an economic one, not one to be fought with nuclear weapons.

Discussing the general apathy toward the peace movement on

MARCH ON TUCK?

the part of students, Hyndman blamed the whole western educational system for giving the students no basis for or background in independent thought.

"Students would probably march on Tuck Shop if we encouraged them to," he said, "but they won't march for peace."

"Nuclear warfare is not an acceptable alternative to anything; no matter what the odds, we must still attempt to bring about nuclear disarmament."

(Al Baker, secretary of campus CUCND)

SCIENTISTS' MORALITY

by Angela Sawchuk

"Three hundred great bombs exploded in positions rather uniformly over the US could kill everyone in the US. The same number would kill almost everybody in Russia. The US has 75,000 of these bombs and the USSR nearly as many." (Dr. Linus Pauling.)

These grim facts raise the question, "Can a scientist who works on atomic weapons claim to be moral?"

With the discovery of fission, and with some technical advances in electronics, physicists have become, almost overnight, the most important military resource of a nation-state. This throws upon scientists a direct and personal responsibility. No long-

er do they have just the responsibility of an ordinary citizen. It is much greater than that, and different in kind.

Dr. D. D. Betts, of the physics department, is acutely aware of his position as a physicist. He feels that we are faced with an "either-or" proposition. Either we realize it is a sin to kill and accept a restriction of nuclear armaments, or else we experience certain disaster.

Dr. Betts is active in both the Edmonton Commission for the Control of Radiation Hazards (ECCRH) and CUCND.

"The notion of a 'clean' bomb (that is, one with no radioactivity) is fallacious", states Dr. D. B. Scott,

CLEAN IS DIRTY!

of the physics department. Although there are means of producing much greater radioactivity than is produced by certain bombs, it is impossible to create a nuclear bomb which is not accompanied by a lethal amount of fallout. Therefore, a "clean" bomb is not actually a "clean" one. It is just one that, by relative comparison, is not as "dirty" as a "dirty" bomb.

Dr. Scott said that it is essential to prevent the spread of atomic weapons. Now that the reaction occurring in an atomic explosion is common knowledge, all one needs to make a bomb is a Ph.D. and a million dollars.

"As long as present civilization exists," says Dr. Scott, "this knowledge will always be with us since technical advancement is as irreversible as the Second Law of Thermodynamics." This means that the learning process is similar to a one way reaction.

In the light of this, says Dr. Scott, the only chance we have for survival is to see that this destructive type of knowledge is never used.

On the question of a scientist's moral responsibility, Dr. Scott points out that it is possible for one to take the view that it is "humanitarian

LURKING EVIL?

to make sure that the 'good' can defend itself against the 'bad'."

Since we in the Western World cherish our democratic traditions and consider communism to be a lurking evil, it is not only our right but our Christian duty to do all we can to maintain our freedom. In short form, this philosophy can be expressed as, "Better dead than Red."

We must not, however, let the 'fight for right' view stereotype things to the extent that we can only see two choices—communism or death. We must realize that there is a third choice—peaceful co-existence through an intelligent understanding of the world situation.

The prominent scientists on this campus feel that a great deal can be done in the lines of informing the masses of the dangers inherent in the atom, and after that has been accomplished, working toward peace will be much easier.