

wards a capacity far greater than they now have. Their competition is, simply not related to military superiority in the modern world. This is partly because each side has an invulnerable submarine arm that can deliver a retaliatory second strike in the event of destructive nuclear aggression and partly because each side already holds a huge "overkill" capacity and, even in this technological age, you cannot kill a person twice.

Manifesto

Early a quarter-century ago, when the world was still unaccustomed to nuclear weapons, a manifesto signed by many eminent philosophers and scientists, including Albert Einstein and Bertrand Russell, put the problem in simple terms: "We have to learn to think in a new way. . . Here, then, is the problem which is present to you, stark and dreadful and inescapable. Shall we put an end to the human race, or shall mankind renounce of their? People will not face this alternative because it is so difficult to abolish war.

"The abolition of war will demand the stasteful implications of national sovereignty. But what perhaps impedes understanding of the situation more than anything else is that the term 'mankind' means vague and abstract. People scarcely realize in imagination that the danger is to themselves and their children and their grandchildren, and not only to a dimly apprehended humanity. They can scarcely bring themselves to grasp that they, individually, and those whom they love are in imminent danger of perishing agonizingly. . . We have to learn to ask ourselves what steps can be taken to give military victory to whatever group we prefer, or there no longer are such steps; the question we have to ask ourselves is: what steps can be taken to prevent a military contest of which the issue must be disastrous to all parties?"

The issue is so huge and the dominance of militarist thinking so thorough that people have forgotten to ask that question. Since the Johnson Administration in the United States, not a single civil servant in Washington has been employed thinking about the feasibility of general and complete disarmament. President Gerald Ford recently promised: "If we get a good agreement (with the Russians), that will keep the lid on strategic arms for the next seven to ten years." He thereby indemnified, by implication, another generation to the threat of universal man-made catastrophe, which, in modern terms,

means catastrophe even while an outbreak of nuclear war is avoided.

For the intensifying war preparations absorb specialist manpower and scarce material resources urgently and desperately needed elsewhere. World expenditure on military research and development alone is \$25 billion annually, according to one authoritative recent survey, about four times the amount spent on medical research. More than 400,000 scientists and engineers, about half the world's total technological manpower, are now engaged in improving existing weapons and developing new ones. World expenditure on armaments is \$210 billion a year, roughly equal to the entire combined income of the poorer half of mankind. The rate of increase of military expenditure coincides with the rapidly-growing technical complexity of weaponry. World investment in armaments has doubled since 1950.

Underestimate cost

These figures probably underestimate the actual cost of weapons if one considers the initial outlay required for the establishment of modern armament industries. At the close of the Second World War, only five countries — the United States, the U.S.S.R., Britain, Sweden and Canada — were major arms-producers. Many developing countries have since joined them, at a huge cost to their economies. The latest to acquire virtual self-sufficiency in arms manufacture is India, which has also developed a nuclear-weapons capacity through its "peaceful" nuclear-energy program aided by Canada, and built up the third-largest army in the world, with more than a million men in uniform.

Representatives of the governments responsible for wasting such colossal public wealth and for endangering your life and mine have been meeting at world conferences concerned with such universal problems as environmental pollution, food shortages, mass unemployment and squalor in the cancerously-growing cities. By common consent, these meetings in search of a global solution to specific problems refrain from paying serious attention to the parasitic military establishment; and they end with resolutions calling for concerted action and regretting the lack of available funds for the purpose. They do achieve marginal results, such as the recently-increased flow of fertilizers to the developing countries after the World Food Conference in Rome and despite the rise of petroleum prices. But these are hardly achievements in terms either of the size of the problems they are intended to solve

Arms production proves costly to developing economies