

(B) Our Objections to Warning Systems, and
Home-Defence Systems against Nuclear Attack

- ① They obscure the fact that the level of suffering caused by even a limited nuclear attack is quite unimaginable, and certainly of a completely different order from all previous forms of warfare.
- ② They encourage the view that nuclear warfare will just have to be faced, and contradict the only possible moral justification for nuclear weapons: that they are "only a deterrent" and will never be used.
- ③ They confirm the ^{dangerous} N.A.F.O. strategy which asserts its ~~the~~ right to a first-use of nuclear weapons, if a ~~the~~ conventional war is going badly.
- ④ They confirm the dangerous policy, geared to first-strike strategy, of targetting on military targets rather than towns.
- ⑤ They are based on very misleading minimum-damage scenarios, which ignore some of the effects of nuclear weapons and/or assume fairly small bombs and/or assume a prepared population, etc., etc., etc.
- ⑥ They ignore the facts that this area is a prime target, and that even the whole of Britain can be destroyed by a combination of blast, heat, fire, firestorm, short-term radiation and longer-term radiation.

SEE OVER

1952 - 3-megaton bombs being exploded.
Key areas will get a number of bombs.

SIZE	BLAST	FIRE
10 megatons	16	45
20 megatons	20	60
50 megatons	26	100
100 megatons	34	140

(7) The contradictions of the arms-race and the nuclear balance mean that warning-systems and civil-defence measures can worry the supposed ~~enemy~~ into thinking you are intending a first-strike, total or limited.