

Nitze: Let's Talk About Nuclear War

Oct. 30 — The following is a letter to the editor of the Washington Post by Paul Nitze, published today. Nitze is an advisor to Jimmy Carter and a member of the bi-partisan "Committee on the Present Danger."

A fundamental point in Henry Kissinger's defense of detente and of unequal SALT agreements has been that, in our time, war between major powers is "unthinkable." I do not remember Joe Kraft ever having pointed out the improvidence of such a blanket position. I therefore find it hard to understand Kraft's support of Kissinger's wrath at Jimmy Carter for having made a lesser and included point with respect to Yugoslavia.

It could be that war between major powers is "thinkable," but if so, we should think about it carefully, consistently and with all the foresight and prudence of which we are capable.

Committee On The Present Danger Announces Its Existence

Oct. 27 — Following is the complete text of a press release announcing the existence of the "Committee on the Present Danger," several of whose members are advising Democratic Presidential candidate Jimmy Carter. The release, which spells out the Committee's post-election plans for thermonuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union, was written by Committee member Paul Nitze, and dated for release Nov. 11.

COMMON SENSE AND THE PRESENT DANGER

First Policy Statement

Committee on the Present Danger:

An Independent Citizens Committee for the Peace, Security and Liberty of the Nation

I. Our country is in a period of danger, and the danger is increasing. Unless decisive steps are taken to alert the nation, and change the course of its policy, our economic and military capacity will become inadequate to assure peace with security.

The threats we face are more subtle and indirect than was once the case. As a result, the awareness of danger has diminished in the United States, in the democratic countries with which we are naturally and necessarily allied, and in the developing world.

There is still time for effective action to ensure the security and prosperity of the nation in peace, through peaceful deterrence and concerted alliance diplomacy. A conscious effort of political will is needed to restore the strength and coherence of our foreign policy; to revive the solidarity of our alliances; to build constructive relations of cooperation with other nations whose interests parallel our own — and on that sound basis to seek reliable conditions of peace with the Soviet Union, rather than an illusory detente.

Only on such a footing can we and the other democratic industrialized nations, acting together, work with the developing nations to create a just and progressive world economy, the necessary condition of our own prosperity, and that of the developing nations and Communist nations as well. In that framework, we shall be better able to promote human rights, and to help deal with the emerging problems of food, energy, population, and the environment.

II. The principal threat to our nation, to world peace and to the cause of human freedom is Soviet imperialism based upon an unparalleled military buildup.

The Soviet Union has not altered its long-held objective of a world dominated from a single center — Moscow. It continues, with notable persistence, to take advantage of every opportunity to expand its political and military influence throughout the world: in Europe; in the Middle East and Africa; in Asia; even in Latin America; in all the seas.

The scope and sophistication of the Soviet campaign have been increased in recent years, and its tempo quickened. It encourages every divisive tendency within and among the developed states and between the developed and underdeveloped world. Simultaneously, the Soviet Union has been acquiring a network of positions including naval and air bases in the Southern Hemisphere which support its drive for dominance in the Middle East, the Indian Ocean, Africa, and the South Atlantic.

For more than a decade, the Soviet Union has been enlarging and improving both its strategic and its conventional military forces far more rapidly than the United States and its allies. Soviet military power and its rate of growth cannot be explained or justified by considerations of self-defense. The Soviet Union is consciously seeking what its spokesmen call "military preponderance." Preponderance, they explain, will permit the Soviet Union "to transform the conditions of world politics" and determine the direction of its development.

The process of Soviet expansion and the worldwide deployment of its military power threaten our interest in the political independence of our friends and allies, their and our fair access to raw materials, the freedom of the seas, and in avoiding a preponderance of adversary power.

These interests can be threatened not only by direct attack, but also by envelopment and indirect aggression. The defense of the Middle East, for example, is vital to the defense of Western Europe and Japan. In the Middle East, a just settlement between Israel and its Arab neighbors is critical to the success of our policy as a whole. Similarly, we and our allies must develop effective policies to assure our independence from coercion through further Soviet-encouraged oil embargoes.

III. Soviet expansionism threatens to destroy the world balance of forces on which the survival of freedom depends. If we see the world as it is, and restore our will, our strength, and our self-confidence, we shall have resources and friends enough to counter that threat. There is a crucial moral difference between the character and objectives of the two super powers. The United States — imperfect as it is — is essential to the hopes of those countries which desire to develop their societies in their own ways, free of Soviet coercion.

To sustain an effective foreign policy, economic strength, military strength, and a commitment to leadership are essential. We must restore an allied defense posture capable of deterrence at each significant level and in those theaters vital to our interests. The goal of our strategic forces should be to prevent the use of, or the credible threat to use, strategic weapons in world politics; that of our conventional forces, to prevent other forms of aggression directed against our interests. Without a stable balance of forces in the world, and policies of collective defense based upon it, no other objective of our foreign policy is attainable.

As a percentage of gross national product, U.S. defense spending is lower than at any time in twenty-five years. For the United States to be free, secure, and influential, higher levels of spending are now required for our ready land, sea and air for-

ces, our strategic deterrent, and above all for the continuing modernization of those forces through research and development. The increased level of spending required is well within our means so long as we insist on all feasible efficiency in our defense spending. We must also expect our allies to bear their fair share of the burden of defense.

From a strong foundation, we can pursue a positive and confident diplomacy, addressed to the full array of our economic, political, and social interests in world politics. It is only on this basis that we can expect successfully to negotiate hardheaded and verifiable agreements to control and reduce armaments.

If we continue to drift, we shall become second best to the Soviet Union in overall military strength; our alliances will weaken; our promising rapprochement with China could be reversed. Then we could find ourselves isolated in a hostile world, facing the unremitting pressures of Soviet policy, backed by an overwhelming preponderance of power. Our national survival itself would be in peril, and we should face, one after another, bitter choices between war and surrender.

IV. In domestic politics, we are independents, Republicans, and Democrats. We believe that foreign and national security policies should be based only upon fundamental considerations of the nation's future well being, not that of any one faction or party. We have faith in the maturity, good sense, and fortitude of our people and in their devotion to our nation.

But public opinion must be informed before it can reach considered judgments and make them effective in our democratic system. Time, weariness, and the tragic experience of Vietnam have weakened the bipartisan consensus which sustained our foreign policy between 1940 and the mid-60s. We must build a fresh consensus to expand the opportunities and diminish the dangers of a world in flux.

We have therefore established the Committee on the Present Danger to help promote a better understanding of the main problem confronting our foreign policy, based on a disciplined effort to gather the facts and a sustained discussion of their significance for our national security and survival.

Rita Hauser:

Soviets Are Isolated In the Middle East

Oct. 25 — Following is the transcript of an interview today with Rita Hauser, presently a member of the Committee on the Present Danger, a former member of the Brookings Institution's study group on the Middle East, and the League of Women Voters' representative in setting up the Ford-Carter debates.

Hauser: There will be no Arab-Israeli conflict in the near future. The Lebanon war is winding down and can be solved on an intra-Arab basis. That will facilitate a Syrian-Israeli entente, and Syria will bring the Palestinians to bay. Israel, as you know, is helping the Christians settle into a security band from the sea to Mr. Hermon. I urged that Israel do this months ago, that the Palestinians had to be frozen into an enclave and isolated.

Q: Do you think that, in the aftermath of the Riyadh summit, the Arabs will unite against Israel?

Hauser: I don't think so. Syria's role has been to wipe out the Palestinians in the battles. If Assad can put down the Palestinians he can settle his troubles with Israel. If there is a sanitized zone created in the south, then there is no need for keeping the Golan Heights. You can walk into Syria from Lebanon! Thus, Israel has an initiative to give up the Golan. A Geneva conference is possible, but it's iffy, could succeed or fail.

Q: Do you think that the Soviets, perhaps in alliance with Iraq and Libya, will try to upset these arrangements?

Hauser: No. The Soviets have lost their card with the Palestinians, and they have no major influence with Syria. Israel has overwhelming military superiority. I don't think the Soviets would provoke the Iraqis into doing something foolish. What I want to stress is that the opportunity that exists could be lost — but I don't foresee anything at all like a military confrontation. If Carter wins, there will be a dead period before the new administration takes office and gets organized.

Q: By the way, I have some material from the American Labor Party on an organization called the Committee on the Present Danger, and your name crops up?

Hauser: Oh, yes. I'm an active member of the executive board. We're going public on Nov. 11. We're concerned about a drift in U.S. defense policy and strategic thinking, especially about the growth of the Russian navy.

Rostow Pushes For Mideast Regional War

Oct. 28 — The following discussion with Eugene Rostow was made available by a staff member of an American Zionist organization. Rostow is a prominent member of the Committee on the Present Danger.

Q: We are very concerned about the developments in the Middle East since the Riyadh conference, especially the possibilities of a confrontation over Israel's role in Southern Lebanon. What do you think the views of the two candidates are on this? Do you agree with Zumwalt's statement we should not have backed down in the Yom Kippur War?

A: Well it's hard to say now what the candidates' views are. However I myself entirely agree with Admiral Zumwalt. I don't think we can back down now either.

Q: But what should we do about the situation. It looks like the Iraqis, Libyans and the Soviets are all very upset about the Israeli action in the South. What if they intervene?

A: The Soviets have got a black eye out of the Lebanon situation so of course they want to recoup. But let me tell you what you should do. Your group should, immediately, get out a statement saying that article 51 prohibits armed intervention of one country in another's affairs, and that since this applies to the Palestinians, they have no right to reoccupy southern Lebanon to use as base against Israel and Israel has full right to defend itself against this threat.

Traditionalists: Carter Risks War

Pittsburgh Press On Ford Speech

Oct. 28 — President Ford addressed the Pittsburgh Economic Club on Oct. 26. The Pittsburgh Press headlined its article on Ford's speech "Carter Risks War" and cited Ford as specifically criticizing Carter's threat to use economic warfare against the Arab nations in retaliation for an oil embargo. The following are the key excerpts from Ford's remarks:

As citizens and voters, you are being asked to decide whether to maintain the great tradition of American foreign policy — a tradition that has kept us strong and at peace — or whether you wish to break from that tradition and venture into the unknown with a doctrine that is untested, untried and in my view potentially dangerous.... The Carter doctrine deviates substantially from the solid principle of bipartisanship of the past. It has a