

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VIII, NO. 6

FEBRUARY 15, 1960



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Sensational Senate Revelations the Press Failed to Report

Atomic Arms for Germany Via A Phoney Emergency?

A little noticed exchange on the Senate floor Feb. 8 indicates the government has been getting ready to play a very dangerous card in the coming summit negotiations. Senator Gore (*D. Tenn.*) was making another of those speeches in which he echoes the Pentagon-AEC line that no agreement to end testing underground is feasible. Monroney (*D. Okla.*) broke in to protest the President's statement that he favored providing our allies with nuclear weapons. Monroney, the first member of the Senate to speak up against this proposal, said nothing was more important to our security than to prevent "a proliferation of countries having the lethal weapons."

To this Gore made an astonishing reply. "I would regret to see such a course of action taken," he said, "but perhaps it might be well for Mr. Khrushchov to know that if he insists upon a Berlin ultimatum, either in the disarmament conference or in the summit conference, such a course of action might be taken by the United States. A nuclear armed Germany and the nuclear arming of powers on the periphery of the Soviet Union would be a great provocation. But so are a threat and an ultimatum concerning the allied position in Berlin."

Easy Way to Torpedo the Summit Talks

What made this the more striking is that Gore had just finished explaining that as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy he had been listening "in secret session" the day before the President's remark to testimony on this very matter. Gore agreed with Monroney that there were "foreboding implications" in such a move. He admitted one danger "would be the obliteration of any real hope for the control of nuclear weapons" and that another would lie in the provocative implications for the Soviet Union and its satellites "of the nuclear arming of West Germany and the possibility of supplying nuclear armaments to Turkey and Japan." Gore doubted whether such action "before the summit meeting" would be conducive to its success. It would indeed torpedo any chance of agreement, which is what Bonn and the Pentagon desire.

The revelations made by Gore in replying to Monroney deserve the closest attention. They indicate that the Administration has been considering (1) using the threat of a nuclear armed Germany in the coming Berlin negotiations or (2) even giving such arms to the Germans and perhaps also the Turks and Japanese *in advance* of the summit meeting. The witnesses at the secret session to which Gore referred were McCone of the AEC, Deputy Secretary of Defense Douglas and Under Secretary of State Merchant. Furthermore Gore's concluding remarks, like the vaguer but anguished questions raised on the floor of the House next day by Chet Holifield

Covering Up the German Angle

The New York Times said Feb. 4 in its news story on the President's press conference that the State and Defense Departments had been making plans "to give complete atomic weapons only to Britain." This reflects official attempts to cover up the plans to give nuclear weapons to the Germans.

It is indicative that the London Times in its leading editorial next day (Feb. 5) made no reference whatsoever to weapons for Britain but treated the President's remarks as an entering wedge for France and Germany. It said "the fact has to be faced" that giving atomic arms to the Germans "would be unacceptable" to most NATO members.

The London Sunday Observer (Feb. 7) in a story by its Defense Correspondent said "The Government has told the three Defense Departments that it does not expect extra nuclear weapons or ballistic missiles from the U.S." despite the Eisenhower remark at press conference "and intends to persevere with the development of Britain's own bombs."

(*D. Cal.*), a senior member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, indicate that these officials canvassed with the committee the possibility of using an executive order to give Germany nuclear arms without asking Congress to change the Atomic Energy Act.

If such a measure is necessary, Holifield pleaded, "then let the Congress debate the issue so that the American people may learn the dire portent of the step we take." Gore indicated the nature of the secret briefing by embarking on a full legal discussion. He said action by the President without changing the Atomic Energy Act (which forbids such a course) would raise two questions. One was whether the President could use the "inherent" powers of his office "to follow one course of action, when Congress has specifically considered the subject and by legislation has provided an alternative procedure." The other was whether "regardless of any legislative prohibitions" the President could use these "inherent" powers "when a grave emergency develops." Gore cited the Supreme Court's decision in the 1952 steel seizure case (*Youngstown Sheet and Tube v. Sawyer*, 343 US 579). All the Justices agreed that (in the words of Clark's concurring opinion) "where Congress has laid down specific procedures to deal with the type of crisis confronting the President, he must follow those procedures." There was no need for Gore to argue the constitutional point, indeed he would hardly have taken time to study the precedents, if the Administration had not seriously been considering ways to short-circuit Congress by a declaration of emergency. Something very dangerous is being cooked up.

But They Want to Do It In Such a Way As to Put the Blame on the Russians

Pentagon and AEC Looking for Formula to Upset Nuclear Talks

The plain truth about the nuclear test negotiations is that powerful forces in the U.S. government would like to end the talks once and for all, and with them the hopes of a disarmament agreement. They are casting about for a formula which will upset the talks but in such a way that they can put the blame on the Russians. What they are trying to formulate now is a proposal which they feel sure the Russians will reject—that is a plan which will permit testing to continue underground but will still demand a large measure of inspection. The military and the AEC want to develop more "miniature" weapons. The further we go along this line the less the chance of ever fighting a non-nuclear war.

More Light on That "Big Hole"

The one-day hearing held by the Humphrey subcommittee Feb. 4 show where follow-through is needed. Except for the Air Force seismologist, Carl Romney, the other three members of our technical negotiating team at Geneva last Fall agreed (1) that too little has been done to implement the Berkner panel recommendations of last March for improving means of detecting underground blasts (2) that they were still hopeful about continuing the talks and (3) that the Russian scientists did discuss the new data and make a real contribution to its understanding. Drs. Fisk and Panofsky also agreed that the Teller "big hole" theory for muffling underground blasts would be very difficult, time-consuming and expensive even if feasible. They said a room as big as the hearing room a half mile underground could muffle a shot of only one-seventieth of a kiloton and that it would take a hole almost as big as the Pentagon for a 70 kiloton blast. That, today, is a small weapon.

Questions They Should Have Asked

It is a pity questioning was not more precise. Of the four Senators present, Gore and Hickenlooper ran interference for the AEC; the youthful Church of Idaho is as cautious as an aging elephant; only Humphrey asked any real questions.

Not asked: Why has there been no estimate of what the im-

21 House Members for Ban on Testing

A bloc of 21 Democratic Congressmen are supporting a resolution, H. Con. Res. 573 by Clem Miller (Cal.), to extend the U.S. moratorium on nuclear testing at least until the end of this year but no Senator has yet been found to join them. The Miller resolution says testing "adversely affects both human health and psychological attitudes conducive to peaceful negotiations"; and cites the U.S. vote for a UN resolution last Fall (78-to-0) for test cessation.

Thompson (N.J.) Feb. 10 became the 19th Congressman to introduce an identical resolution. The others are Ashley (Ohio), Blatnik (Minn.), Burdick (N.D.), Flynn (Wis.), Foley (Md.), Gray (Ill.), Green (Ore.), Johnson (Col.), Karth (Minn.), Kastenmeier (Wis.), Kowalski (Conn.), Meyer (Vt.), Rivers (Alaska), Roosevelt (Cal.), Wier (Minn.), Wolf (Iowa) and Harmon (Ind.). Vanik (Ohio) agrees "in principle" and may do likewise next week. Porter (Ore.) is supporting H. Con. Res. 573 but has a broader measure, H.R. 4295, which calls for no testing as long as other nations don't test. This has been buried more than a year in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

provements agreed upon in the new talks at Geneva would do to the efficiency of the 180-station system? Is it true that using arrays of 100 instead of 10 seismographs at each station would bring the detection threshold down to 7 or 8 kilotons; that putting seismographs in deep holes would bring this down even further? Congressman Porter of Oregon was calling the attention of the House at press time Feb. 10 to the fact that Russian delegates at the recent "foothills" parliamentary conference in London agreed to the use of unmanned seismographs in addition to the 180 stations (as recommended by the Berkner panel). This would further improve detection. Prof. Jay Orear of Cornell told the London meeting U.S. delegates had been instructed not to bring up the question of unmanned stations. Why? This is a question we hope the Humphrey subcommittee will explore in further hearings.

Ignored by the Press: Three Who Spoke Up for Arms Control in Senate Feb. 8

"Forty-one billion dollars or forty-two billion dollars are being poured into this economy today for military expenditures. Does anyone want to suggest this is a free economy? There is no free economy in the U.S.A. today. The economy of America today is basically a military economy, with a great many businessmen in America subsidized with national defense expenditures. Businessmen are the most subsidized group in America. The business subsidy makes the subsidy which the farmers get look like economic peanuts.

"We shall not have any true prosperity when that prosperity is built upon between \$41 and \$42 billion of military expenditures. We cannot eat the fruit of those expenditures. We cannot wear them. They do not house us. . . . The sad feature is that such expenditures advance the danger of the destruction of the United States. . . . The American people need to be awakened to the great danger that confronts them as we, along with Russia, lead mankind, I fear, to its own destruction by building up a nuclear arms race which cannot be squared with a single moral principle that we teach our boys and girls."

—Senator Morse (D. Ore)

"The United States is the only nuclear power which has not accepted total and permanent disarmament under adequate international safeguards as its goal. . . . I think that it is a disgrace. The British have done it. The Russians have done it. We have not done it. If the newspaper accounts of the disarmament report furnished the President by Mr. Coolidge are correct, we are not going to do it at the 10-nation disarmament conference convening in Geneva next month."

—Senator Clark (D. Pa.)

"With a number of my senatorial colleagues, I was in Russia when Khrushchov made his proposal of total disarmament before the UN. Our reaction was the same: What are we—the U.S.—going to respond? What answer is the President going to make to this? If this is a phony proposal, it should be immediately challenged. If it is a sincere proposal, we should promptly support it. . . . But there was a complete silence from our administration, a completely negative attitude. . . . I think the cessation of all nuclear tests is not an unattainable goal. We should strive for it, persist in it, until we get it."

—Senator Gruening (D. Alaska)