

Counter Force Means An Endless Arms Race and A Garrison State

(Continued from Page One)

Thus the Air Force could stay in business forever, and war continue as the main sport of mankind.

Patent Medicine for A NATO Headache

Why did Mr. McNamara unveil this nonsense in a speech which was designed to appeal over de Gaulle's head to France and Western Europe against the idea of an independent nuclear deterrent? Because just as Russia fears we may be crazy enough to press that button, Western Europe is haunted by fear that we really aren't; it saw Mr. Dulles, the advocate of liberation, not only hold back when the East Germans rose in 1953 and the Hungarians in 1956 but hasten to assure Moscow we would not intervene. It fears we might similarly hesitate to commit suicide for the sake of West Berlin. That is why the French and behind them the Germans are pressing for a deterrent of their own. To make this seem unnecessary, Mr. McNamara is trying to tell them that we have a wonderful new plan by which we could smash Russia's war power and still survive if Moscow threatened a vital Western interest. Our bombers and ICBM's would destroy Russia's in a twinkling; all the city dwellers of Western Europe and America would have to fear is fallout and for that two weeks underground on the Pentagon's new protein wafers would suffice. Counter-Force is the patent medicine to end NATO's biggest headache.

We hope public opinion at home and abroad will wake up to the side effects. Counter-Force means an unlimited arms race, in which each side must strive to stay so far ahead that it can wipe out the other's forces in one first strike. It puts a higher premium than before on secrecy, to keep those bases from being spotted by the enemy. It invites extension of the race into outer space, in which new commanding vantage points may be established. The best discussion of its consequences I have seen is the brilliant little book of Arthur Waskow's "The Limits of Defense" (Doubleday) which I recommend highly for those who want to understand the mysteries of "stabilized deterrent" and "counter force." The latter would increase the temptation to strike first. "Every major international crisis," as Mr. Waskow writes, "would press both sides quickly to the brink of war, and if counter-force strategy had been highly developed, beyond the brink." This is a recipe for hair-trigger tension. The domestic consequences were soberly spelled out by George A. Lowe in the leading article of the April issue of the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings. They are "unlimited numbers of hardened fixed-base missiles, greatly accelerated arms race in space, enormous civil defense . . . tremendous governmental regimentation." This shapes military doctrine and national destiny to

How We Estimate Soviet Missiles

Chairman RUSSELL (D. Ga.): I notice your estimate of the intercontinental missiles the Soviets have on launching sites is [deleted by censor]. . . . How do you get at the composite; do you add up what you [the Air Force] put and what the Army puts and what the Navy estimates and the CIA, and divide it by 4? Just how do you get at it?

General SMITH [Vice-Chief of Staff, Air Force]: No, sir. That is not so. May I ask General Breitweiser [Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence, Air Force] to give you the way the estimate is arrived at.

General BREITWEISER: All of the agencies, of course, Mr. Chairman, work from the same body of evidence [deleted by censor]. . . .

RUSSELL: Who makes the final determination of what the Secretary of Defense brings us or what the President is furnished about the number of missiles on launchers?

BREITWEISER: The national intelligence estimates with which you are familiar, Mr. Chairman, contain [deleted].

RUSSELL: I see. Thank you, sir. I understand it a little better. I have been concerned about that. In the last analysis then the President just takes his choice of which one he thinks is most credible.

—Military Procurement 1963: Senate Armed Services Committee hearings, Jan.-Feb. 1962, pps. 519-20.

the hungry needs of the aviation and uranium industries.

Except for a few vague and heavily censored references in recent hearings of which we give samples on these two pages, this move toward counter-force with all its fateful implications has been brought about without discussion in public or Congress. Only a small stratum of intellectuals, some working for, others against, the military machine, are aware of the controversy, even understand its terminology. Here we see dramatically displayed the erosion of free and representative government, its abdication to an elite and their computers.

What if the Russians refuse to play the game? What if they stick to a second strike retaliatory threat against our people and cities? What if they move on from 100-megaton weapons to 1,000-MT monsters? Twenty of the latter detonated high up and dirty would do us in. This would be the natural strategy for a power which is ahead of us in heavy weight rocketry but behind in resources. It is time the American public realized where it is being led and took a good look at this weird delusion that in the age of the mononuclear weapons you can pinpoint hidden bases while leaving cities and people unscathed. It has been said that the world would be in danger if the H-bomb ever fell into irrational hands. Will we wake up one of these days to find that it has—and that the hands are ours?

Russell of Georgia Attacks the Delusion Nuclear Wars Can Be Fought Like Tournaments

"There have been some estimates and some so-called mathematical computations of the casualties that would result from a nuclear war under various assumptions, including a positive attempt by the adversaries to limit targeting to military installations and facilities. . . . To me these extrapolations . . . are exceedingly unrealistic. They presuppose a war being waged with rational restraint by both sides. I doubt that there could be anything rational in the

awful eventuality of a nuclear attack. . . .

"The day of the tournament has long since passed into history. I am convinced that we would be deluding ourselves if we were to base any national policy on the assumption that any potential adversary would be restrained and rational and abide by any such rules. In my opinion, if nuclear war begins, it will be a war of extermination."

—Russell (D. Ga.) to the Senate April 11.

A Country-Wide Survey of the Many Peace Candidates Now in The Field

By Sanford Gottlieb

Peace, which has been elusive both as a condition of human existence and as an issue in American politics, is making a modest comeback in pre-November electioneering. New England abounds in "peace candidates," running primarily for the educational value of airing the issue in the political arena. Others are running in Baltimore, Detroit, Ithaca and central Illinois. They have entered races as Democrats, Republicans and independents. Moreover, their effort is complemented by the campaigns of a vigorous group of Democrats, concentrated largely in California, who are running not to educate but to win.

In the latter category the situation in the redistricted 29th Congressional District of Los Angeles promises the earliest rewards. There, State Assemblyman George Brown has won the Democratic primary in the face of opposition by Rep. Chet Holifield and the party regulars. *The Liberal Democrat*, an independent journal close to the Democratic club movement in California, claims that Holifield put another candidate named Brown in the primary race in order to reduce the Assemblyman's chances. Some of the labor unions backing Brown were subjected to intense pressure by the Democratic organization in an effort to make them shift their endorsement. Nevertheless, with an excellent liberal voting record, Brown held his labor support. He also attracted the peace groups into a new and effective coalition with the unions and the club movement.

SANE Takes A Hand

Brown, City Councilman Edward Roybal and attorney Jerry Pacht, running respectively in the Democratic primaries of the 29th, 30th and 31st C. D.'s, campaigned vigorously in favor of disarmament, an end to nuclear tests, and realistic planning for conversion to a peacetime economy. SANE and Women Strike for Peace succeeded in directing 350 of their local members into the three campaigns as volunteer workers, displaying an ability to "deliver" which is without precedent for peace groups. Both Brown and Roybal survived the primaries.

Brown will face one of the three avowed members of the John Birch Society running on the Republican ticket in California. The issues could not be more clearly drawn. The district has a Democratic majority, and, barring an unforeseen upheaval, Brown should be elected in November. Roybal faces a tougher fight against incumbent Rep. Gordon McDonough. In the Bay Area, two more Democrats espousing a strong peace platform have won the primary and face Republican incumbents. They are John O'Connell of San Francisco and Charles Weidner of Contra Costa County.

Among the peace candidates who are campaigning mainly to educate the voters, the best known is H. Stuart Hughes, professor of history at Harvard and author of six books. Eminently qualified to compete in the "Battle of the Dynasties" in Massachusetts by virtue of his kinship to the late Chief Justice Hughes, Stuart Hughes is seeking 72,514 signatures on a statewide petition by July 24 in order to qualify as an independent candidate for the Senate. His campaign began in May with hundreds of volunteers, many of them young housewives, collecting the signatures in a door-to-door canvass. Disinterested observers and even some of Ted Kennedy's aides admit that Hughes is off to a good start. If the President's younger brother wins the Democratic primary, a result by no

Key Congressional Fights

Foreign policy issues loom large in the efforts of Frank Kowalski and William Meyer to win Senate seats in Connecticut and Vermont, and in the campaigns of Congressman Robert Kastenmeier (Wis.) and William Fitts Ryan (N. Y.). Kowalski is challenging John Bailey's machine and its candidate, HEW Secretary Abraham Ribicoff. Kowalski needs 200 delegates at the Democratic convention in July in order to force a primary election. He claims 230. Meyer was the Capitol's firmest voice for peace during his single term (1958-60). Opposing popular Senator George Aiken in a heavily Republican state, Meyer describes himself as a Democrat who takes an independent view of domestic and world issues. Kastenmeier has been made a target of the GOP because of his role in producing *The Liberal Papers*. Because of redistricting, Ryan faces a rugged primary fight.

means assured because of growing resentment against dynastic pressures, Hughes may well find himself in a position to swing a close election to the Republican candidate.

Like his fellow New England peace candidates, Hughes is backed by Political Action for Peace (PAX), which was established this year in order to encourage election campaigns based on the need for disarmament and stronger international institutions. The PAX candidates are united in their support for a policy of unilateral initiatives, a sustained series of acts by the United States designed to produce favorable reciprocation by the Russians.

In 1960, only William Hefner of Greenfield, Mass., campaigned for Congress as a peace candidate. Although he placed third in a field of three in the Democratic primary, he proved his point: that an election campaign can generate more discussion of and publicity about disarmament than the activities of a local peace organization. This year Hefner will run again. He will be joined in the neighboring Third District of Massachusetts by Elizabeth Boardman, a mother of six and co-founder of Voice of Women—New England. In New Hampshire, still another PAX candidate will campaign jointly with her husband, who operates a Quaker school. Helen Bliss, a Democrat, will oppose incumbent Rep. Perkins Bass.

Other individuals have set out on their own as peace candidates. Harrop Freeman, professor of law at Cornell, will run as an independent in the Ithaca area. In Baltimore, Mrs. Caroline Ramsey has already won the Republican primary in the district represented by Congressman Samuel Friedel. In Detroit, Mrs. Elizabeth Weideman will challenge Rep. John Lesinski in the Democratic primary. In central Illinois, Bob Wilson, a Quaker farmer who owns five country weeklies, is the Democratic candidate in the 22nd District. Wilson is linked to Jerome Ziegler, a young Democrat running in the Chicago suburbs with the backing of the party regulars, through the organization Voters for Peace. Another Quaker farmer with the unlikely name of Herbert Hoover ran unsuccessfully against Senator Hickenlooper in Iowa.

The greatest value to flow from this burgeoning interest in peace candidates may be the experience in practical politics which it provides for several thousand members of peace groups. Increasingly determined to change the political climate through the ballot box, the peace movement is developing its cadres in 1962 for what could be a major effort in 1964.