

1959

Editorial

Joseph Arnold
Denison University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.denison.edu/exile>



Part of the [Creative Writing Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Arnold, Joseph (1959) "Editorial," *Exile*: Vol. 5 : No. 1 , Article 2.
Available at: <http://digitalcommons.denison.edu/exile/vol5/iss1/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the English at Denison Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Exile by an authorized editor of Denison Digital Commons.

375,730c
Vito
1957-60

EDITORIAL

On October 4, 1957, man reached into the heavens to place one of his own stars there. To the amazement of the world, that first star was Russian, not American. The initial effect was stunning; the after effect is startling.

Named Sputnik, and since joined by a second fellow-traveler, this phenomenon has created consternation throughout the Free World, and free world scientists concede that this achievement proves that Russia does possess the most feared weapon of our age, the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile. This missile, traveling in outer space and armed with hydrogen or cobalt warheads, could hit the United States within thirty-five minutes after hurtling into the air from a launching platform inside Russia.

Some three years ago Sir Winston Churchill termed the present situation in international relations one of a "balance of terror" rather than the traditional "balance of power." If his phrase was apt three years ago, it is even more apt today. Man can now destroy in a matter of hours, and possibly minutes, a civilization that it has taken him thousands of years to create. Man is caught in his "balance of terror," and the decision for or against survival hangs by the thin thread of his own rationality.

Never before has man faced so starkly the facts of survival. In times past each new weapon has been followed by some workable defense. But if the ICBM's were used in massive retaliation, there could be no defense. Both sides sending this weapon of massive destruction at each other would present a unique situation in history—a war without even a nominal winner. If the impact of the explosion didn't blot out human life, then the radio-activity of the fall-out would.

Global warfare of the ICBM variety—even if the United States must temporarily rely on the Strategic Air Command to deliver its hydrogen bombs—makes the frontline concept obsolete. The entire world is the front-line of any future war, and as the Russian Chief

of State Krushchev remarked, it is too late to talk once the missiles start flying. Facing our circumstance, neither spurred by false optimism nor frozen by despair, we must evaluate the foreign policy of our nation.

Our present policy, built upon the sands of fear and terror, is not a workable foreign policy; indeed, it is not likely to long be a tenable policy. Threats and counter-threats constitute the basis of our current relationship with the Soviet World. It is time we started building a foreign relation on the rock of co-existence. It is time we realized that only through international respect and tolerance can both Russia and the United States exist on this planet, and that non-cooperation is the most effective weapon with which to annihilate the human race.

The search for understanding may be centered in three areas, the first of which is international travel. The United States should lift its nearly complete ban on travel to Soviet countries. Most nations consider our ban on the travel of American newsmen to China, despite the fact that China will allow them to enter, to be a mockery of our freedom of the press. In the May 13, 1957 issue of *The New Republic*, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles said, "Foreign policy diploma can not succeed unless it channels the activities of our people, and in that respect newspapers also have their loyalty and patriotic duty." The *Republic's* editorial staff commented pointedly, "It (now) becomes our duty not to know what is happening. However, if we do not know, how can we criticize those—such as Mr. Dulles—who do know?"

A second action which can lead to greater international cooperation is freer international trade. There has been some progress here since the Second World War, such as the "common market" plan for Western Europe, but the scope of such a plan must be broadened. The barriers constricting trade with Communist countries must be lifted. Already, the ban on trade to Communist China costs us the favor of our strongest Eastern ally, Japan.

Thirdly, steps must be taken to increase the interchange of ideas. The Russians recently held an international scientific meeting which was attended by several Americans. Upon returning, one American scientist commented that he felt that within ten years, barring war, the United States and Russia could be exchanging scientific data as freely as the US and Britain do now.

Of primary importance is the realization that mankind's actual battle is not between the Soviet and non-Soviet world, but between civilized humanity and poverty, ignorance, and intolerance. These are enemies that can best be fought cooperatively.

The theory of world government is not a new one. Men have been discussing its merits and defects for hundreds of years. Only recently has it become the alternative to world annihilation. The earliest records of history reflect a trend toward increasingly larger political communities. From patriarchal families, to tribes, to cities, to city-states, to nation states, and finally, to our present regional organizations, man has shown progress in cooperation.

It is primarily through cooperation that man has been able to improve the world around him. Now he must bring the warmth of his heart to the cold light of a man-made star to assure himself and his children a world and a future.—GG, VCW

In this issue the editors of EXILE are proud to publish "The Accused" by Ellen Moore. This poem has been awarded the semi-annual Denison Book Store-EXILE Creative Writing Prize.