

non-nuclear fights in the world since the Atomic and even the Hydrogen Bomb were invented. War, it seems, can be waged in the atomic age without the use of atomic weapons. Furthermore, there are two situations in which, it seems to me, these nuclear weapons might be used even in the knowledge of the dangers that might result from doing so.

First, if an aggressor knew that his victim had become weak and careless and had ignored the necessity of keeping ready for instant and resolute use the means of swift and powerful nuclear retaliation. Weakness here would remove the deterrent effect of the possession of nuclear war power. That is why the primary and persistent objective of Communist policy is to lull us into a false sense of security and persuade us to destroy all atomic weapons prior to any other form of carefully supervised disarmament.

Secondly, a nation which was on the verge of conquest by what we now, ironically, call conventional weapons would be under impossible pressure not to use nuclear weapons if they were available.

It is inconceivable that any general would stand by and watch his troops being defeated by an overwhelming superiority of numbers while he had in his arsenal a means which might restore the situation. Would we, or our possible enemies, permit ourselves, or they, themselves, to go down under a foreign invader while in possession of any weapon that might stop him? The answer is no. Indeed, the decisive nature of the weapon would itself likely determine in favour of using it if the alternative were defeat and destruction by other weapons.

In a war of limited area and limited objectives, as in Korea, nuclear weapons could be put aside. But in total war, it would be different. Sooner or later, the hydrogen bomb would be employed and the horrors of nuclear attacks would be visited on both sides.

So we must face the practical certainty that if any general war is allowed to begin, it would become nuclear war, and both sides would have to face the catastrophic consequences. Surely, any creature capable of reason must prefer the present situation, however unsatisfactory, to such consequences. Surely, too, both sides would prefer to tolerate the uncertainties of present day life to the certainties of nuclear war. Surely, finally, the alternative to peace is now so horrible, that all governments will eventually come to realize that peace must be made secure.

There remain, however, these local wars which, without involving atomic annihilation, have nevertheless caused much blood and much sorrow. The threat of the H-bomb may not