

16th Pugwash Conference on Science and World AffairsSopot, 11-16 September 1966

Robert Jungk
(Austria)

Can Neomilitarism be Changed?The lacking incentive

Neomilitarism derives its strength to a certain extent from the fact, that is able to gear the excess capabilities of the modern over-developed technological societies towards concrete purposes and definable goals. The large majority of people have begun to perceive that these purposes (preparedness kept permanently up to date) and these goals (keeping a seat "at the top table" among the "Big Powers") are unrational, yet they feel that there exists so far no other incentive but preparation for war powerful enough to make the economy go, and even expand and modernize.

The argument that armaments are unproductive no longer cuts ice among modern economists. They see the armaments race as necessary evil just because it is unproductive and allows big investments, whose results will not clog up the channels of distribution.

If we want to fight neomilitarism effectively we will have to think about goals and investments, which would be powerful enough to play a role as "locomotives" for continuing scientific and technological development. In other words: could we invent a "peace machine" as powerful as the "war machine"? Could we guarantee the people who have become beneficiaries of the "war machine" (from the military people to the industrialists and down to the millions who in one form or another profit from the armaments race) gain and employment?

The role of the "Think Factories"

There is another side to this picture. The "neomilitarists" talking about coming possible, or even probable, conflicts have to a certain extent "monopolized" the concrete factual thinking about the future. They "think about the unthinkable" in considerable detail. The American "think factories" financed by the different branches of the armed forces have developed a great