

Harriman, IPS Push War And Warnke On The Hill

Democratic Party patrician Averell Harriman and Richard Barnet codirector of the Institute for Policy Studies terrorist command center, joined forces Feb. 17 in a Capitol Hill organizing session to boost Paul Warnke's nomination to head the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Their forum was a seminar of the "Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy," a neo-Fabian group whose leadership includes Senator George McGovern and Rep. Benjamin Rosenthal.

Joining Harriman and Barnet on the speaker's rostrum was Prof. Walter Clemens of Boston University, who is a Fellow at the Kennan Institute for Russian Studies in the Woodrow Wilson School of International Affairs at Princeton. The seminar, held in a House hearing room, was attended by several hundred Congressional aides, Institute for Policy Studies hangers-on, and others.

All three speakers stressed that the chance for a SALT II accord not be allowed to "slip away," and that the Presidency of Jimmy Carter and the addition of Paul Warnke as ACDA head are "just what we need to reach a favorable agreement." Here, some highlights of the seminar presentations:

Averell Harriman: "One thing I can tell you *categorically* — the leaders of the Soviet Union do *not* want to have a war. They just came through a terrible war (i.e., World War II — NSIPS); Brezhnev says this and you've got to believe him. Don't believe people who say they are working for a first strike capability. They don't want to see their nation destroyed. It is *nonsense* to think that their objective is to see Moscow and Leningrad destroyed. Why in Leningrad, they just got through rebuilding and restoring the Czarist palaces — they don't want to see this destroyed...."

"We have got to get an agreement to stop the increase in weapons, this qualitative increase, because science is developing on both sides so fast that soon we will not be able to verify agreements...."

"Look at Brezhnev's V-E Day speech. It is for peace. He said he does not want war, but that the USSR will support 'liberation movements.' This means communist subversion, but it is toned down from Krushchev, who said they support 'liberation wars'....We must never let our conventional forces be so weak that they cannot do their job...."

"It is a great sacrifice for Mr. Warnke to accept this post (as ACDA head — NSIPS)...He will of course function according to Mr. Carter's orders — and Mr. Carter is, of course, an expert in the nuclear field...Mr. Carter also has to face the fact that there are Communists who do not want better relations with the U.S. because they say it will weaken them."

Richard Barnet: "I agree very much with the general tenor of Mr. Harriman's remarks, except for his statement that conventional forces have a job to do in Europe. I do not think that a European war could be easily controlled not to go to the strategic nuclear level...(Note:

Barnet formerly worked in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency)...."

"It is not that the Soviets have a plan to win a nuclear war — but there is a dangerous illusion on both sides that somehow nuclear weapons can be used for political purposes. But the only thing nuclear weapons are good for is deterrence, and for this, the number of weapons can be greatly reduced...."

"From the beginning the U.S. has been way ahead in military development. The Soviet Union has always been imitative in relation to U.S. technological development. The Soviets for a long time tried not to join the arms race. Khrushchev tried to bluff us, cause they couldn't afford to put resources into the arms race. But this approach suffered a setback at the time of the Cuban Missile Crisis, because the United States' superiority was revealed. So the Soviets had to commit themselves to arms build-up. This has now reached a point that U.S. admitted that there is rough equality, and so the last administration made some arms agreements. Therefore the lesson the Soviets learned is that you get results if you speak from a position of power."

"There are now people in this administration and in the Soviet Union who are ready to except equality. We must move now towards agreement while the time is right....We should move competition with the Soviet Union away from the military sphere and toward the economic, etc. The military is where the Soviets can best compete with us...."

"I much agree with Mr. Harriman that most important for our security is maintaining domestic strength (i.e., economic and such). We face the impending end of the fossil fuel economy — that is a much bigger security threat, and yet the strategy we pursue to deal with the very remote threat of the Soviets attacking us keeps us from dealing with these greater threats."

Walter Clemens: "The Soviet Union's main concern being raising their living standards, they would hardly even want to compete with us, let alone attack us. Historically, their military response has been defensive. there is no pattern of general aggressiveness. Most of the ways in which the Soviets have threatened world peace have come from their sense of inferiority rather than superiority...."

"SALT I agreements were remarkable for their achievements. Now we must build on this. The objective situation is very favorable — there is rough equivalence and Brezhnev has staked his career on peace, as has Carter. But we must settle for rough equality, because there will never be a time when we have complete equality of weaponry. We are ahead in some kinds of weapons, the Soviet Union is ahead in some kinds. And we also must recognize that there are other differences, for instance, the Soviet Union is surrounded by enemies: China, West Germany, and maybe also East Germany. The U.S. has only Cuba as an enemy close by, and that may even be changing."

In the Question Period:

Averell Harriman: "The Soviets, especially recently, have made some major breakthroughs at the frontiers of scientific research which could have major and immediate military applications, which might not be 'verifiable.'...It will be necessary to reach a comprehensive test ban outlawing tests of new kinds of weapons..."

"Changes in the Soviet Union will have to come from within, and they will come, because of the urge of humanity, which is on our side, on the side of human dig-

nity, and it will be impossible to keep so many people of such diverse cultures in line. Stalin had a problem with the nationalities; he had to use heavy repression. This will be a problem again."

Rep. Rosenthal: "Yes, there will be a struggle of nationalist groupings that are very hard to control."

Richard Barnet: "The Soviet Union is concerned with relations with the rest of the world, and they know that military competition and domestic repression interferes with economic relations. They are very influenced by world opinion."

EXCLUSIVE

Fusion Energy Foundation Tour Builds Political Alternative To Carter No-Energy Program

In the past week, Dr. Morris Levitt, director of the Fusion Energy Foundation, has initiated a tour of West Coast campus and industrial complexes, drawing attendance of approximately 100 at forums at Occidental College, California Polytechnic Institute, and elsewhere. On Monday, Feb. 14, Levitt told an overflow crowd of 400 at the prestigious Comstock Club in Sacramento that the influence of such people as Jerry Brown and Ralph Nader must be removed before they completely sabotage U.S. industrial development, and, amid resounding cheers, declared that it is a necessity for the U.S. to develop fusion power.

It was the second energy-oriented address in a month for the Comstock Club, which last month heard Joseph R. Rensch, president of Pacific Lighting Corporation, rip into "negative growth" advocates who are playing "energy brinkmanship" in holding back the development of new energy supplies, and heavy press coverage of the Levitt speech has confirmed the depth of public interest in the subject of energy growth. The Sacramento *Bee* summed up its report of Levitt's address by saying, "California has gone off the deep end on restrictions on growth of industry;" the story also made the points that the energy shortage has been contrived by certain political interests, that California Governor Jerry Brown's philosophies run counter to humanity's highest achievements, and that nuclear and other future energy sources must be developed. KFBK radio carried a story on Levitt's charge that the drought afflicting California has been caused by the deforestation of the Amazon jungle of

Brazil five times in 24 hours, plus five spots discussing fusion energy, why it is preferable to fission, and Levitt's charges that the U.S. fusion program is being sabotaged.

U.S. Labor Party energy program memorials, calling on the U.S. Congress to speed the development of fusion and make maximum use of presently available resources including fission energy, have now been introduced in the Connecticut, Oregon and Washington state legislatures, and are now being drafted in Wisconsin, Vermont, Colorado and Ohio. In addition, the proposal is in preparation or receiving intense consideration in Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Missouri, South Carolina and California. At the same time that Levitt was in San Francisco, Rep. John Burton volunteered in a speech to constituents that he would introduce the USLP legislation to Congress.

After an appearance at the University of Washington Feb. 15, Levitt testified before the Washington State Senate Energy Committee — which is considering the memorialization bill — and immediately drew a sharp political response. One member of the Senate Committee, confronted with the proposal which has been sponsored by both the leading Democrats and Republicans in the State Senate, attacked the bill as "an insult to President Carter." The Washington proposal calls for the development of fusion and the fostering of scientific education.

Similar responses have surfaced during the tour of FEF spokesman Dr. Stephen Bardwell of Pittsburgh, Michigan and Ohio. Following Bardwell's speech at