

Nuclear Dis-Argument

During the 1930s, the era of the Great Dictators, a faction in the West argued that the only way to achieve peace was to disarm, hoping that the Dictators would keep their promises to do likewise, and meanwhile to concede their demands and tolerate their crimes in order to persuade them that we were not belligerent (the Dictators' supposed belief that we were belligerent being the supposed cause of their demands and crimes). Unfortunately, this policy was adopted, and very soon caused the most destructive war in history with some fifty million dead.

In the minds of many people, this sequence of events had tested that policy to destruction. The very word 'appeasement', which had been proudly coined by the policy's own supporters, became a term of abuse. It remains so to this day, with the amusing consequence that ever since then, appeasers have been obliged to deny they are appeasers in order to get a hearing.

During the Cold War, the appeasers argued that the only way to achieve peace was to disarm unilaterally and hope that the Soviet Union and Communist China would follow suit, and meanwhile to concede their demands and tolerate their crimes in order to persuade them that we were not belligerent (the Communist dictators' supposed belief that we were belligerent being the supposed cause of their demands and crimes). Fortunately, fewer people than before now accepted this argument, and the policy was never enacted, thus preventing the most destructive war in history with some hundreds of millions dead.

Though the appeasers' position was not tested to destruction this time, the outcome of the Cold War nevertheless refuted it: the Soviet Empire did not launch a nuclear attack. Instead, it fell – though not before it had tried every possible strategy to conquer, enslave and intimidate other nations *without* provoking a nuclear response.

Which brings us to the present day, and another chapter in the shameful history of the appeasement faction. Only this time, it is not a matter of a flawed argument or a refuted argument, but of no argument.

The British Ministry of Defence is planning to redevelop its nuclear weapons facility at Aldermaston to replace Britain's Trident nuclear deterrent in 2010 if the need should arise. Anti-nuclear activists

marched on the facility this Easter weekend in an attempt to stop this. The BBC comments:

The MoD insists whatever is decided will be within Britain's legal obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

But that treaty requires the signatories to work "in good faith" for total nuclear disarmament and forbids the acquisition of new nuclear weapons.

Actually the **Treaty** permits the modification of current nuclear weapons, which is what is being planned. Article X even allows signatories to withdraw under "extraordinary circumstances" – like, say, an Islamofascist country like Iran **getting nukes**?

But what is the supposed point of unilateral disarmament this time? The position of today's appeasers, who call themselves "peace protesters", is cruder and more reprehensible than that of their forebears. They are not fearful of invasion or destruction. They are fearful of the United States. They believe – viscerally – that the United States and its allies, especially Israel and Britain, *are* the essential evil in the world. They want this evil to be disarmed and if necessary eradicated **by force**, and for the future of the world to depend instead on the goodwill of the world's most irrational and tyrannical rulers, granted a monopoly of the world's most destructive weapons.

But the facts remain as they always were. The peace of the world is in no danger from British nuclear weapons, nor American nor Israeli ones. The exact opposite is the case. And in the current security situation, to reduce our capacity to retaliate against a nuclear strike is to invite such a strike from the enemies of civilisation.

Tue, 04/13/2004 - 23:01 | [digg](#) | [del.icio.us](#) | [permalink](#)