Is There Sufficient Reason For a TestBan? What Are Disadvantages of Such a Ban?

There are two questions that we must consider: 1) Is there sufficient reason for banning nuclear development tests? 2) Might such a ban have serious disadvantages, both military and otherwise?

The U.S. Government spends about 85% of its budget on military items. We are building up our military establishment not because we want to use it, but because we believe that as long as we remain strong enough to cope with aggression there will be no war. This policy is variously referred to by the terms military deterrent, or massive retaliation. Whatever it essentially implies is that any time we make any sort of disarmament agreement with Russia, we cannot be sure that it will effect the strength of the Soviet Union equally as much as we are certain of the U.S. Any such agreement must be fully bilateral in its military effects, as we cannot create an imbalance of power that might increase the possibility of war.

The negative position can be stated in three points: 1) the proposed ban of the affirmative will be to a great degree unilateral in its military effects, creating the basis for an imbalance of power; 2) the ban will impair our strategic capabilities in several military situations; 3) the ban will make important peaceful applications of nuclear blasting impossible.

The ban will tend to be unilateral because the U.S. depends almost completely upon nuclear weapons in its arsenal, whereas the Soviet Union depends not only upon nuclear weapons, but upon a wide variety of conventional weapons. Hence by freezing nuclear technology at its present level we are affecting not only the U.S. more than Russia.

Harry Kinssinger points out in the latest issue of Foreign Affairs that "Rightly or wrongly, the free world has based its defense on nuclear weapons . . . whereas the great world, would use those conventional forces to resist the Soviet dependence on conventional strength; and moreover there is no immediate prospect of developing them. Nothing now stands in the way of Soviet domination of Europe and the Soviet reluctance to pay the price of nuclear war."

By freezing military technology we are destroying the great execs of our armed forces, whereas it would increase the possibility of war. Civilian and defense, can continue to advance to improved weapons. Clearly we have been a case of unilateral disarmament, and a dangerous basis for an imbalance of power that could increase the possibility of war. Yet we go on to point 2 and examine several possible areas where there are weapons systems whose development is vital to our defense, but whose development the affirmative proposal will make impossible.

First is the area of anti-radiation warfare. We are all aware of the large degree of anti-radiation warfare. We are all aware of the importance of anti-radiation warfare in our defense system, particularly in the light of the Russian advances in the opposite field.

Another important area is that of anti-nuclear warfare. And third, and perhaps most important, is that of small nuclear weapons with limited radiative . . . (remotely called clean war.)

Dr. W. F. Libby of the AE stated that "We're faced with a feed against an attack on NAT availability of tactical nuclear weapons. One of limited fallout would provide a defense which did not impair our non-combatants and free countries by local radiodunnery weapons fired in free space. We have further tests to complete development.

Leaving the military field; I consider point 3, the peaceful use of nuclear technology, as well as weapons test being to have been eliminated, for we would prevent Russia from developing to a new nuclear weapon under the threat of peaceful block. In other words, by adapting a test ban proposal, we are protecting the knowledge of nuclear blasts the point where we know how to use it in a wide variety of civil problems, but know very little about the vast field of peaceful civil usages.
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