



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES
A DIVISION OF HEBREW UNION COLLEGE – JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

MS-630: Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler Digital Collection, 1953-1996.
Series A: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1961-1996.

Box
4

Folder
5

East-West accord, 1984.

For more information on this collection, please see the finding aid on the
American Jewish Archives website.

E. W. O'Connor

December 26, 1984

Mr. James F. Leonard
East-West Project Director
Aspen Institute of Humanistic Studies
1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1070
Washington, D.C. 20036


Dear Mr. Leonard:

Rabbi Schindler is out of the city and will return early in January. I know he will be delighted to find your letter awaiting him and your booklet on Managing East-West Conflict. Be assured these will await him on his return to his desk.

With every good wish and kindest greetings, I am

Sincerely,

Edith J. Miller
Assistant to the President



Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies

1333 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Suite 1070, Washington, D.C. 20036 • (202) 466-6410

R. O. Anderson
Chairman

J. E. Slater
President

December 17, 1984

Rabbi Alexander Schindler, President
Union of American Hebrew Congregations
838 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York

Dear Alex,

I enclose a small booklet which has been under preparation for the last two years, believe it or not. Things that cook that long usually haven't got much taste left in them, but I hope maybe this is an exception. For a couple of our participants, at least, it was not sufficiently bland and they declined to sign. (Kissinger was the most noteworthy.)

I hope you will find time to read it and will like it. If that should be the case, perhaps you would have helpful ideas on how to get continuing attention to its central ideas. They will be controversial in the Jewish community, but precisely for that reason discussion would be healthy.

Perhaps I could drop in on you early next year. I'd enjoy seeing you even without a pretext, but your counsel on this would be most useful.

Sincerely,

James F. Leonard
East-West Project Director



Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies

1333 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Suite 1070, Washington, D.C. 20036 • (202) 466-6410

R. O. Anderson
Chairman

J. E. Slater
President

The New York Times

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1984

Western Study Group Calls for Less Reliance on Nuclear Deterrence

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Nov. 26 — A group of Western public figures issued a report today that said that although nuclear deterrence had so far preserved the overall peace, it was essential to reduce Western reliance on nuclear weapons in Europe.

While stopping short of advocating a policy of "no first use" — not being the first side to use nuclear weapons — the panel recommended that "the Atlantic alliance move toward no early use of such weapons." It said that "a consensus appears to be forming in support of this important objective."

The report, called "Managing East-West Conflict," was issued by the Aspen Institute International Group, a panel that included many former heads of government. It was set up by the larger Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies in 1983. The Aspen Institute describes itself as "an international non-profit organization," which has often brought together prominent citizens from many countries to discuss pressing issues.

At a breakfast meeting with some reporters today, Robert S. McNamara, a Defense Secretary in the 1960's, who was one of the signers of the document, said he was heartened by some recent moves announced by Gen. Bernard D. Rodgers, the supreme NATO commander, to improve the alliance's conventional forces and to extend the period it would take in a clash with the Russians before the allies faced the choice of defeat or using nuclear weapons.

More Meetings Are Urged

The report, written before the announcement last week that Secretary of State George P. Shultz would be

meeting on Jan. 7-8 in Geneva with Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko of the Soviet Union, said that "all thoughtful people are concerned over the state of East-West relations."

"Hostility runs high," it said, "contacts are sparse; rhetoric has clouded reality, and there are risks of dangerous misunderstandings. The fear of a military confrontation leading to nuclear war looms large in the popular mind."

It recommended that there be more high-level meetings between East and West, including summit meetings.

"Summit meetings are especially important," it said. "If they are more frequent, unrealistic expectations will thereby be deflated."

The report called for the start of negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States on controlling antisatellite weapons and for resuming the suspended negotiations on reducing nuclear arms. These are the goals of the Shultz-Gromyko meeting.

It also recommended that the United States propose to the Russians the creation of a new body to be called a strategic panel.

"This body would initially be composed of a small number of high-level U.S. and Soviet representatives," it said.

What Panel Would Do

The group would hold confidential, informal talks and "would be charged with establishing a security dialogue, weaving together the many strands of arms control negotiations and defense policy decisions involving NATO and the Warsaw Pact," the report said.

It said that, initially, the panel "could explore ways of reducing the numbers of nuclear weapons in Eu-

rope, controlling technological innovation, improving verification and treaty compliance, and enhancing stability."

"We believe the East-West arms control agenda is long," the report said, "and time is short. There cannot be winners and losers in this search for viable arms control agreements, for no nation will sign or honor an agreement it believes to be harmful to its vital interests. Arms control is a mutual endeavor whose goal is enhanced mutual security. It is time to move forward."

In its recommendations on ways to reduce the risk of a nuclear war, the panel called for the further withdrawal of short-range, battlefield nuclear weapons from the dividing line in Central Europe, because their current deployment "could bring heavy pressure on political leaders to allow their use during the earliest stages of any NATO-Warsaw Pact conflict, lest they be overrun before a decision could be reached."

In defending the policy of mutual deterrence, the panel said that there currently exists "a cautious stalemate" between East and West. "Each side's weapons insure that the other's are not used; each deters the other," it said.

"Such deterrence, in our judgment, is neither immoral nor illogical," the report said. "There have now been almost four decades of nuclear peace, in spite of serious East-West crises. But deterrence may not be eternal, and behind it there always yawns the atomic abyss."

"Any policy which cannot withstand a single major failure, whether of a machine or a fallible human being, is understandably questioned by thoughtful people the world over," it said.

"Hence the search for positive alternatives to deterrence should continue, hand in hand, with attempts to strengthen and stabilize deterrence."

'Star Wars' Plan Criticized

Mr. McNamara and another signer of the report, George F. Kennan, former Ambassador to the Soviet Union, were two of the four authors of an article published today by Foreign Affairs magazine that urges President Reagan to drop his plans to try to develop a fool-proof defense against nuclear missiles, a program officially called, the Strategic Defense Initiative, but more commonly known as "Star Wars."

The article, also signed by McGeorge Bundy, White House national security adviser in the 1960's, and by Gerard C. Smith, head of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency under President Nixon, said that Mr. Reagan's initiative was "a classic case of good intentions that will have bad results because they do not respect reality."

In March 1983, Mr. Reagan called for intensive research to find a way to make nuclear weapons obsolete. It has been criticized by many experts as a waste of resources because they contend that no defensive system could succeed in blocking all offensive nuclear weapons.

"What is certainly and fundamentally wrong with the President's objective is that it cannot be achieved," the authors said.

The authors called on Mr. Reagan to reaffirm the American commitment to the existing treaty limiting defensive ballistic missiles and to seeking ways of limiting the size of each side's nuclear arsenals.

Excerpts From Report on Making Nuclear War Less Likely

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Nov. 26 — Following are excerpts from a report, "Managing East-West Conflict," made public today by the Aspen Institute International Group on East-West Relations:

A. Basic Principles

The undersigned have been involved in international relations for most of the atomic age. Our experiences have taught us that neither East nor West can be secure when the other is insecure, particularly with respect to nuclear weapons. There can be mutual security or mutual insecurity, but it will be mutual in either case. What can be done?

Each side's weapons insure that the other's are not used. Each deters the other. Such deterrence, in our judgment, is neither immoral nor illogical. There have now been almost four decades of nuclear peace, in spite of serious East-West crises. But deterrence may not be eternal, and behind it there always yawns the atomic abyss. Any policy which cannot withstand a single major failure, whether of a machine or of a fallible human being, is understandably questioned by thoughtful people the world over. Hence the search for positive alternatives to deterrence should continue, hand in hand with attempts to strengthen and stabilize deterrence.

It is vital that East and West alike resist the siren song of "superiority." Neither side will permit the other to achieve a meaningful superiority, and attempts to gain an advantage are dangerous as well as illusory. A stable balance should be the goal. It alone cannot guarantee peace, nor does it fire the imagination, but it can be made to work.

B. Reducing Risks: No Early Use

The unimaginable horror of thermonuclear war should not blind us to the imaginable horrors of conventional war. A sound security policy for the West must reduce the risks of both. This is so not only because a conventional war with modern weaponry could be even more destructive than World War II, but because such a war would be the most likely prelude to nuclear war. This is particularly true in Europe, where the forces of NATO and the Warsaw Pact face each other directly and where even a skirmish would raise the specter of nuclear war.

We believe it is essential to reduce Western reliance on nuclear weapons in Europe. We therefore recommend that the Atlantic alliance move toward no early use of such weapons.

One means of reducing nuclear risks deserves priority attention: the further withdrawal of NATO short-range, battlefield nuclear weapons from the dividing line in Central Eu-

rope. Their present disposition far forward could bring heavy pressure on political leaders to allow their use during the earliest stages of any NATO-Warsaw Pact conflict lest they be overrun before a decision could be reached.

C. Maintaining Security

As reliance on short-range nuclear weapons declines, Western security must be adequately protected and public opinion reassured. We believe that NATO's current troop strength can maintain alliance security provided that more effective use is made of the troops already on hand. The alliance should aim at:

¶Improving relative conventional capabilities through better use of available funds and manpower.

¶Organizing and utilizing reserves more effectively.

¶Developing new defense technologies (so-called force multipliers) and assuring a major European role in producing them.

¶Gaining better early warning mechanisms, both through new technology and through confidence-building measures negotiated in the Vienna and the Stockholm talks.

¶Increasing the relative weight of Europe in assuring its security.

¶Consolidating and enhancing the role played by France.

D. Curbing the Arms Race

It can only be a source of deep dissatisfaction to leaders and people, both East and West, that for more than 10 years no nuclear arms control agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union has been signed and ratified.

We believe the goals of the West, with respect to nuclear arms control, should be to maintain an adequate deterrent posture while:

¶Improving strategic stability.

¶Regulating the modernization process.

¶Reducing the numbers of weapons in stages.

¶Lessening tensions.

These goals should be reflected both in Western defense programs and in negotiations with adversaries.

The troubled arms control process demands a high priority. As first steps, we recommend:

¶Talks should begin promptly between the U.S. and U.S.S.R. on controlling antisatellite weapons.

¶U.S.-Soviet negotiations on reducing nuclear arms should recommence.

¶Confidence-building measures from the Atlantic to the Urals are being stressed in the Stockholm Conference on Disarmament in Europe. If they have real content, such measures can help reduce the risk of nuclear war. They should be combined with a more general renunciation of force, which is already being discussed at Stockholm.

¶Previously negotiated U.S.-Soviet agreements on nuclear testing should be brought into force and the trilateral U.S.-U.K.-U.S.S.R. talks on a comprehensive test ban should be resumed.

There are two important negotiations, stalled for more than a decade, which do not focus on nuclear weapons. They can, however, contribute to central objectives if they are given high-level attention and impetus.

¶An initial agreement on mutual and balanced force reductions should be given visible priority, perhaps through a foreign ministers' meeting.

¶A verifiable agreement to prohibit possession of chemical weapons would help to control their proliferation. It would also relieve fears of a chemical attack in Europe against which NATO might not have an adequate nonnuclear response.

We strongly endorse the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which has served the world well since its signature 16 years ago.

E. Opening a New Channel

We recommend that the West, in the first instance the United States, propose the creation of a new body: a strategic panel. This body would initially be composed of a small number of high-level U.S. and Soviet representatives. The strategic panel would be charged with establishing a strategic dialogue, weaving together the many strands of arms control negotiations and defense policy decisions involving NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

We further recommend that the West propose a network of crisis control centers, linking the capitals of the nuclear-weapon states and perhaps other key locations as well.

We believe the East-West arms control agenda is long, and time is short. There cannot be winners and losers in this search for viable arms control agreements, for no nation will sign or honor an agreement it believes to be harmful to its vital interests. Arms control is a mutual endeavor whose goal is enhanced mutual security. It is time to move forward.

Signers of the Aspen Study

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Nov. 26 — Following are the Western public figures who signed the report of the Aspen Institute International Group, which was made public today:

Austria

Bruno Kreisky, former Chancellor

Britain

James Callaghan, former Prime Minister

Edward Heath, former Prime Minister

Nicholas Henderson, former Ambassador to the United States

Shirley Williams, president, Social Democratic Party

Canada

Ivan Head, president, International Development Research Center

Mitchell Sharp, former Foreign Minister

Pierre Elliott Trudeau, former Prime Minister

France

Jean-Pierre Cot, former Minister, Ministry of External Relations

Edgar Faure, former Prime Minister

Italy

Sergio Belinguer, minister, Foreign Ministry

Umberto Colombo, president, Nuclear and Atomic Energy Agency

Gianni Di Michelis, Minister for Labor and Social Welfare

Giorgio LaMalfa, chairman of House Committee of Foreign Affairs

Japan

Saburo Okita, former Foreign Minister

Seizaburo Sato, professor, University of Tokyo

Portugal

Mário Soares, former Prime Minister

South Korea

Hahn-Been Lee, professor, Yonsei University

Sweden

Pehr Gyllenhammar, chairman, Volvo

United States

Robert O. Anderson, chairman, Arco

The Rev. Theodore Hesburgh, president, Notre Dame University

Jacob K. Javits, former Senator

George F. Kennan, former Ambassador to the Soviet Union

John J. McCloy, Presidential adviser

Robert S. McNamara, former president, World Bank

Elliot L. Richardson, former Secretary of Defense

Joseph E. Slater, president, Aspen Institute

Cyrus R. Vance, former Secretary of State

West Germany

Countess Marion Dönhoff, publisher, Die Zeit

Helmut Schmidt, former Chancellor

Berndt von Staden, former State Secretary, Foreign Office

Former World Leaders Want East-West Contact

The Washington Post

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1984 A9

A sweeping increase of "constructive contact" between East and West at all levels—political, military, economic, cultural and human relations—was proposed yesterday by 35 former government heads, Cabinet ministers, diplomats and business leaders from the United States, Western Europe and Japan.

The group called for ambitiously reshaping basic concepts for dealing with the Soviet Union at a time when "hostility runs high, contacts are sparse, rhetoric has clouded reality, . . . risks of dangerous misunderstandings" exist, and "fear of military confrontation leading to nuclear war looms large in the public mind."

What the West needs, they said, is "a coherent, widely supported policy, rooted in reality and pressed with conviction and determination," to protect its vital interests, enhance its political cohesion and offer "hope of influencing Soviet policy in a favorable direction" without expecting "the grand antagonism between East and West to end."

U.S. elder statesman John J. McCloy called the proposal—"A Framework for Sustained Engagement"—"a philosophy of interdependence" that will "challenge the Soviet Union to positive action."

The program, the product of a two-year review by the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, was made public yesterday at news conferences here and in New York, London, Bonn, Rome and Tokyo.

Signers of the statement include former West German chancellor Helmut Schmidt, former British prime ministers James Callaghan and Edward Heath, former Canadian prime minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau, former secretary of state Cyrus R. Vance, former secretary of defense Robert S. McNamara and former foreign ministers Saburo Okita of Japan and Sergio Belinguer of Italy.

"Soviet conduct," including "trampling human rights at home, disregarding sovereign rights abroad—of which Afghanistan and Poland are but the latest examples—requires the West to remain watchful and strong," they said. But "apocalyptic rhetoric notwithstanding, East and West are not locked in a duel to the death."

Their proposals included:

- Multiplying "summit and subsummit meetings, bilateral and multilateral," not deferring them on the basis that "important agreements are not likely to emerge."
- Making tensions in such areas as the Middle East, the Horn of Africa and Iran and Iraq the subject of East-West discussions.
- Moving Atlantic Alliance policy toward "no early use" of nuclear weapons. McNamara noted in the news conference here that this stops short of the "no-first-use" policy, which he and others prefer.
- Creating "a strategic panel" of high-level U.S. and Soviet representatives to engage in a confidential and informal "strategic dialogue" on arms control and defense policy, plus "a network of Crisis Control Centers" in nuclear weapons states.

Los Angeles Times

Tuesday, November 27, 1984

Tuesday, November 27, 1984/Part I. 7

West Urged to Disavow 'Early Use' of A-Arms

By DON SHANNON,
Times Staff Writer

WASHINGTON—The "grand antagonism" between the West and the Soviet Bloc will continue indefinitely, and the West should help ease tension by moving toward renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons, an international group of former heads of state,

diplomats and businessmen recommended Monday.

Because the Soviet Union is not "disintegrating," the West must live with it in a semi-permanent state of hostility, a report by the Aspen Institute concluded.

While the study said that the West's nuclear deterrent policy—under which Moscow has never been certain whether the Western allies would strike first—has led to peace in Europe since World War II, it nevertheless called for a less precarious alternative.

"Our experiences have taught us that neither East nor West can be secure when the other is insecure, particularly with respect to nuclear weapons," the report said. "There can be mutual security or mutual

insecurity—but it will be mutual in either case."

The report urges that the "Atlantic Alliance move toward no early use" of nuclear weapons and calls for the removal of short-range nuclear weapons as a first step. It applauded moves for U.S.-Soviet arms control talks, as well as urging increased troop strength and improved conventional weapons. The panel strongly opposed projects such as the Reagan Administration's anti-satellite weapons program.

"Eastern and Western leaders are custodians of the world's future," the study declares. "They bear a joint responsibility for reducing the risks of their inevitable competition and maintaining nu-

clear peace. . . . Containing, and influencing Soviet power requires that the West be strong. . . . It does not require confrontation."

A total of 25 U.S., European and Japanese authors, including five former heads of state, prepared the study over a two-year period. Former Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara presented the report at a Washington news conference.

McNamara advocated adoption of a firm Western pledge forswearing first use of nuclear weapons, but noted that European participants in the study opposed such a hard-and-fast position as contradicting the strategy of deterrence.

The study supported normalization of trade and maximum communication between the two blocs,

Margaret Chapman of East-West Accord called in re letter asking you to be on committee -- it was a request via Jim Leonard....Hy Bookbinder and Phil Klutznick have said yes....you were checking out others -- not sure if via al or david---recall letter.....they are eager to go to press and want your response at the earliest--- and photo of it's a yes....duplicate of letter wn route here...
202-544-5300 office....

Please show it
to me tomorrow
so that I can
make decision.

Called
1/24/85



American Committee on East-West Accord

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS

GEORGE F. KENNAN - Honorary Chairman
Diplomatic Historian
Former U.S. Ambassador to USSR

JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH - Co-Chairman
Professor Emeritus, Harvard University
Former U.S. Ambassador

DONALD M. KENDALL - Co-Chairman
Chairman, PepsiCo, Inc.

ROBERT D. SCHMIDT - President
Chairman and CEO,
Jacobs Wind Electric Co.
Former Vice Chairman, Control Data Corp

FRED WARNER NEAL - Executive Vice Pres
Former Chairman, Intl. Relations Faculty
Claremont Graduate School

STEPHEN SCHLOSSBERG - Vice President
Washington Counsel, UAW

TILFORD E. DUDLEY - Secretary-Treasurer
President, Property Mgmt. & Maint.

JEANNE VAUGHN MATTISON - Director
Former Washington Director,
Council on Economic Priorities
Development Director,
Federation of American Scientists

WILLIAM ATTWOOD
Author, Former U.S. Ambassador

GEORGE W. BALL
Former Under Secretary of State
Former Senior Managing Director,
Lehman Bros., Kuhn Loeb, Inc.

MEYER BERGER
Chairman, M. Berger Co.

THOMAS CABOT
Chairman Emeritus, Cabot Corp.

HODDING CARTER III
Chief Correspondent, PBS-TV Inside Story
Former Assistant Secretary of State

SIMON CHILEWICH
President, Chilewich Corp.

STEPHEN F. COHEN
Dir., Russian Studies Program,
Princeton University

ARTHUR MACY COX
Author, Columnist

JOHN CULVER
Partner, Arent Fox Kintner Plotkin Kahn
Former U.S. Senator (D Iowa)

CURTIS GANS
Writer, Consultant

ADMIRAL NOEL GAYLER (USN Ret.)
Former Commander in Chief, U.S. Forces Pacific
Former Director, National Security Agency

ARMAND HAMMER
Chairman and CEO, Occidental Petroleum, Inc.
Ex Officio Member

THEODORE M. HESBURGH, C.S.C.
President, University of Notre Dame

TOWNSEND HOOPES
President, Assoc. of American Publishers
Former Under Secretary of the Air Force

CARL MARCY
Former Chief of Staff
Senate Foreign Relations Committee

VICE ADMIRAL J. M. LEE (USN Ret.)
Former Commander, Seventh Fleet Amphib. Force
Former Asst. Director, A.C.D.A.

GLORIA LEMOS
Vice President, Coca Cola Co.

ROBERT S. McNAMARA
Former Secretary of Defense
Former President, The World Bank

WILLIAM MCSWEENEY
Executive Vice President,
Occidental Petroleum, Inc.

STEWART RAWLINGS MOTT

JEROME OTTMAR
President, Amtel-Amica, Inc.

ARA OZTEMEZ
President and Chairman,
SATRA Corp.

AVERY POST
President, United Church of Christ

MAROLD B. SCOTT
Chairman, Syracuse Supply Co.
Former Pres. US-USSR Trade and Econ. Council

MRS. DUNCAN M. SPENCER
New York City

MRS. JAMES P. WARBURG
President, The Bydale Foundation

JEROME B. WIESNER
Former Presidential Science Advisor

LEONARD WOODCOCK
President Emeritus, UAW
Former U.S. Ambassador, PR

SCIENCE ADVISORS

SIDNEY D. DRELL
Deputy Director, Stanford Linear Accelerator Center

RICHARD L. GARWIN
IBM Fellow, Thomas J. Watson Research Center

MARVIN L. GOLDBERGER
President, California Institute of Technology

FRANKLIN A. LONG
Professor Emeritus, Cornell Program on Science,
Technology and Society

WOLFGANG K. H. PANOFSKY
Professor, Stanford Linear Accelerator Center

GEORGE W. RATHJENS
Professor of Political Science, MIT

JACK RUINA
Professor of Electrical Engineering, MIT

CARL SAGAN
Director, Lab. for Planetary Studies, Cornell Univ.

KOSTA TSIPIS
Senior Scientist, MIT

JEROME B. WIESNER
President Emeritus, MIT

HERBERT F. YORK
Director, U. of Cal. Program in
Science, Technology and Public Affairs

JERROLD R. ZACHARIAS
Institute Professor, MIT

109 Eleventh Street, Southeast
Washington, DC 20003
Telephone: 202 546-1700

June 8, 1984

*Reproduced
copy of
correspondence
from ACEWA
files -*

Rabbi Alexander Schindler
President
Union of American Hebrew Congregations
838 5th Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10021

Dear Rabbi Schindler:

On behalf of the Board of Directors of the American Committee on East-West Accord, I extend an invitation to you to become a member. As you may know, the Committee is an independent, tax-exempt, educational organization aimed at strengthening public understanding of balanced, verifiable arms control initiatives and mutually beneficial programs in science, culture and nonmilitary trade between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

This year will be an especially difficult and dangerous time in U.S.-Soviet relations. Now more than ever, solutions must replace stalemates. Increasingly, the American Committee is becoming known for its problem-solving approaches.

Because we need especially qualified members, it gives me particular pleasure to invite you to join. The material enclosed further describes our goals.

I look forward to your response.

With best wishes,

Jeanne Vaughn
Jeanne Vaughn Mattison
Director

Enclosures:

Brochure
East/West OUTLOOK
Membership card

*P. S. Jim Leonard suggested
that you may be particularly
interested in the American
Committee.*



American Committee on East-West Accord

Summary of Projects, 1984-85

1. COMMON SENSE IN U.S.-SOVIET TRADE. A collection of essays by experts on U.S.-Soviet trade, describing how trade affects the political relations of the two societies and setting forth recommendations for more effective U.S. trade policies. The book has received enthusiastic response from public officials, the business community, and media, including articles in The New York Times, Business Week, and professional journals, a review by the Department of Defense, television and radio appearances by the authors on major networks and PBS.

2. East/West OUTLOOK. An eight-page bimonthly newsletter on the work of the Committee which covers all aspects of U.S.-Soviet relations. Published since 1977, OUTLOOK reaches over 5,000 people in the media, in key government positions, the diplomatic community and interested individuals and groups.

3. "General Nuclear Settlement." This project incorporates the American Committee's original DEEP CUTS project into specific arms control proposals in the context of a comprehensive general nuclear settlement.

4. "American Specialists on the Soviet Union." This project draws systematically on the insights of leading American experts on the Soviet Union from diplomacy, academia, business, and the media, and makes the findings available for concrete problem-solving assistance in meetings with senior responsible persons in Congress and the Executive Branch.

5. "Ambassadors Emeriti." A continuation of the successful program of meetings with the seven living former U.S. Ambassadors to the Soviet Union.

6. "Interim Joint Commission, US-USSR." The American Committee is exploring ways, consistent with the Logan Act, to offer an unofficial channel of communication between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. The Commission involves very high Soviet officials and distinguished Americans.

7. "U.S.-Soviet Coexistence." An unofficial joint exploration of the requirements for genuine coexistence between the superpowers. This project would contribute to preventing future military interventions and explore all aspects of the meaning of "non-use of military force."

Jan 85

Summary of Activities
1983 - 1984

A. Highlights

(1) Publication and widely favorable reception of Common Sense in U.S.-Soviet Trade.

(2) Evolution of the American Committee's DEEP CUTS Plan into a proposed "General Nuclear Settlement", with co-sponsorship by the Union of Concerned Scientists.

(3) Development and initial funding of a new project to make systematic, policy-relevant use of "American Specialists on the Soviet Union" to the Congress and the Executive Branch.

B. General

During 1983-1984 the American Committee on East-West Accord has continued to put its principle emphasis on efforts to promote reduction and control of nuclear arms, and to promote expansion of nonmilitary U.S.-Soviet trade. The Committee has also sought and developed other opportunities, across the whole range of U.S.-Soviet relations, to maintain and improve understanding between the U.S. and the USSR. Members with expertise in various aspects of U.S.-Soviet relations have appeared on television and radio programs including "The Phil Donahue Show," "Nightline," "Meet the Press," "McNeil-Lehrer Report," and similar programs; addressed university audiences and other organizations including, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Lawyers Alliance for Nuclear Arms Control, the Union of Concerned Scientists, the League of Women Voters and senior magazine editors; written articles for journals with national circulation including the New York Times Magazine, The Atlantic Monthly, The New York Review, the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, and The New Yorker; and published op-ed articles in major newspapers including The New York Times, The Washington Post, and the Los Angeles Times. In addition, members and staff have spoken to numerous groups of citizens around the country and have participated in various conferences on aspects of U.S.-Soviet relations, both in the United States and in the Soviet Union.

C. Nuclear Arms Control

This year members of the Committee presented testimony to Congress, in particular the Senate Armed Services Committee, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and other various sub-committees, on behalf of its "General Nuclear Settlement" project, and have met with individual

members of Congress to further elucidate the proposal. The Committee also made information and analyses available to Congress on related matters such as the MX missile, the Scowcroft report, A-SAT weaponry, the so-called "Star Wars" plan for a space-based ABM defense, the nuclear winter and the state of U.S.-Soviet relations, national security and nuclear arms control.

The Committee was productively engaged with the issue of alleged Soviet arms-control treaty violations, preparing and circulating informational materials on this issue a month before President Reagan was due to state his position on it. The Committee holds that no substantive violations have been proven, although in some instances technical provisions may have been pushed to the margin. The East-West Committee maintains that the Standing Consultative Commission is still the right place for both parties to raise and resolve questions of alleged treaty infractions. In the end, the President decided to soft-pedal his treatment of the issue as he has recently with "Star Wars".

On behalf of the Committee, Admiral Noel Gayler contributed to public education on defense matters with an op-ed article in the Wall Street Journal citing nine major nuclear weapons-delivery systems, each of which is now in development, with the essentially identical function of striking strategic targets within the Soviet Union. Major budgetary savings would be obtainable, the article points out, by focusing on this redundancy. Additionally, op-ed articles by 26 of the Committee's Board members have appeared in major newspapers across the country.

In the course of the year the Committee elaborated its DEEP CUTS proposal by setting out the context for a "General Nuclear Settlement." Given the stalemate in the nuclear negotiations, we began to consider problem-solving approaches of a more comprehensive nature. What would it take to restore a climate for serious and substantive negotiations? Some requirements seem obvious: Stop shouting; ratify the three pending treaties, including SALT II. Still others appeared necessary to address given the nonproductivity of past efforts.

These considerations began in an article in the New York Times Magazine and were then drawn together in a speech by Admiral Gayler at Cornell University, then in a draft Congressional Joint Resolution. We also took advantage of the Presidential election, in a nonpartisan fashion, and offered the substance of the "General Nuclear Settlement" project to each Democratic candidate and President Reagan. Two of the candidates have invited further discussion and one candidate used the "General Nuclear Settlement" in a major foreign policy speech. The plan has been submitted to the Democratic Platform Committee by Senator John Culver and Admiral Noel Gayler will be submitted to the Republican Platform Committee by our Co-chairman, Donald Kendall. We have also discussed the proposal with Administration officials at the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the Department of State.

Beyond official impact, we are reaching out nationally to individuals and other organizations including the Union of Concerned Scientists itself, now a co-sponsor of our "General Nuclear Settlement." They will contribute their prestigious reputation, members' time, 200,000-plus mailing list, and some funding to our joint enterprise.

D. U.S.-Soviet Trade

The American Committee contributed substantially to this year's Congressional deliberations on renewal of the Export Administration Act, through its timely publication of Common Sense in U.S.-Soviet Trade.

The book is a major study by distinguished Americans with broad experience in U.S.-Soviet trade. The authors appraise the pluses and minuses of U.S.-Soviet trade and its influence on the political relations of the two societies. Domestic political constraints such as the Jackson-Vanik and Stevenson Amendments are examined, along with a number of other provocative issues including the use of sanctions as a political tool, technology transfers to the East, and tapping Soviet technology.

Common Sense in U.S.-Soviet Trade has enjoyed an uncommonly favorable response from public officials, the business community and the media. Articles and reviews have appeared in The New York Times, the Department of Defense Review of Literature, Business Week, and others, and Committee members have been invited to make radio and television appearances. The book is being used as a course text at five universities, by policy planning staffs in the White House and the Departments of State and Commerce, and by Congressional committee staffs dealing with export administration.

A number of American Committee members have been active during the year writing and speaking on East-West trade, attending trade conferences, publishing articles and op-ed pieces, and presenting testimony to Congressional committees. The American Committee continues its contact with business organizations and corporations involved in U.S.-Soviet trade activities. Plans are underway for the establishment of a Trade Advisory Committee to help develop new trade projects.

The American Committee was represented at the Chicago World Trade Conference in April by members Erwin Salk, C. William Verity, Jr., and Margaret Chapman. Included was a panel discussion on U.S. Soviet trade and an exhibit which featured the trade book and material about the Committee and its activities.

The Committee's guiding philosophy in this field is that trade is valuable in itself and as a form of discourse between the two societies; also, that American interests will be served by the expansion of nonmilitary trade and the adoption of sound guidelines for export control.

E. American Specialists on the Soviet Union

In the past year the American Committee conceived, organized and obtained initial funding for a new method of improving American policy making vis-a-vis the Soviet Union.

The basic idea for this "American Specialists" project is straightforward. Arms control, trade and other policies toward the Soviet Union are often founded on assumptions for which there is doubtful empirical support: "The MX will drive the Soviets to the bargaining table"; "an economic boycott will push the Soviet gas pipeline into disarray." There are well-qualified experts, in the media and business and academe, who could inform such perceptions if called upon to do so. But they are typically not summoned, the resource lies unused, and ill-founded policies result.

We aim to alter that condition by forging a systematic, working connection between the American Specialists and officials of the U.S. Government. Over a three-year period, we would bring the Specialists together with each other and with senior policy audiences, sequentially, in the Congress, the Executive, the Washington press corps, and the Allied and Soviet Embassies. The American Specialists will speak from their strengths to the policy makers' weakness: namely, knowledge of the Soviet system and what moves it.

The working premise for this project is that the Specialists will meet for a day every two months in Washington to consider a discussion paper on one or more of the issues agitating relations between the U.S. and the USSR. Areas of consensus and separate positions (if desired) will be noted for summarization, that evening, as the point of departure for a dinner discussion with one of the policy audiences. There may be a second session, with a different policy audience of the U.S. government, at lunch the following day. The policy makers will each have occasion to frame subjects for analysis and to pursue them beyond the meetings.

A first organizational meeting of the Specialists was held in Washington on April 27 and approved the foregoing guidelines. It was agreed to aim for a first substantive meeting in September with the bipartisan Senate leadership. A second meeting will be sought after the Presidential election with the senior political advisors of the winner.

F. Ambassadors Emeriti

The Ambassadors Emeriti project brings the seven former U.S. Ambassadors to the Soviet Union together on a periodic basis so that their views can be made accessible to the Executive and Legislative branches of the U.S. government.

All sessions are held in Washington, all are off the record, and each session is attended by all Ambassadors -- W. Averell Harriman, Foy Kohler, George Kennan, Jacob Beam, Malcolm Toon, Thomas J. Watson, Jr. and Walter Stoessel. Recent guests have included Secretary of State George Shultz, Deputy Secretary of State Kenneth W. Dam, and Under Secretary of State Lawrence S. Eagleburger.

These private meetings have stimulated individual Ambassadors to engage in expanded public discussion of U.S.-Soviet relations. They have spoken from a variety of platforms, written articles, and appeared on television programs. In June 1983, Ambassadors W. Averell Harriman and Thomas J. Watson, Jr. testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the state of U.S.-Soviet relations. Ambassador George Kennan, also invited to testify, was out of the country at the time; however, his address at the American Committee's Annual All-Member meeting on May 17, 1983 was placed in the hearings record (and, later republished in The New Yorker, winning that magazine the top public-service award from the American Society of Magazine Editors.)

The Ambassadors participated in a video history taping by the Sloan Foundation in April 1984 for the benefit of future historians and scholars of U.S.-Soviet relations. The session was moderated by Robert Kaiser, editor of the Washington Post's "Outlook" section. Funding for this project has been renewed by the Ford Foundation for two more years.

G. East-West OUTLOOK

As of January 1984, the editorship of this publication was transferred from Carl Marcy to Roland S. Homet, Jr. with no major change in structure or emphasis. Bi-monthly issues are distributed to local and national media, interested individuals, organizations, Congress, and American Committee members.

Articles this past year have included the Board's 80th birthday tribute to George F. Kennan, a reminiscent transcript of Nikita Khrushchev's 1959 meeting with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, a statement for the American Committee by Robert D. Schmidt on the Soviet downing of the Korean airliner, a 50th anniversary commemoration of the establishment of U.S.-Soviet diplomatic relations, Donald Kendall's prescriptions for East-West trade, and Noel Gayler's proposal for a "General Nuclear Settlement."

New features recently instituted include membership activities and a summary of current projects. Future issues are planned to include guest editorials, invited articles, discussion papers from the Specialists project, and original interviews with Congressional and Executive Branch officials.

H. Membership

Membership in the American Committee on East-West Accord is by invitation with a total present membership of 364. The Committee has never conceived of itself as a mass organization, but rather as a relatively small group of distinguished and influential individuals brought together by common interest. In the past year our Board decided that it would be appropriate to ask each member to support the Committee with a modest annual fee of \$60 -- expecting that individual members will, to the extent of their ability, provide more substantial support, financial and otherwise.



American Committee on East-West Accord

*Eddie—
This brochure is
being updated,
including new members
listing & new photos.
This is the reason
for urgency in timing.
We want to include all
invited members if possible.
M.E.*

109 Eleventh Street, S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20003
(202) 546-1700

AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON EAST-WEST ACCORD

The American Committee on East-West Accord is an independent, educational organization aimed at improving East-West relations with special focus on US-Soviet affairs.

The purpose of the East-West Committee is to strengthen public understanding of initiatives to control and reduce nuclear arms and to encourage mutually beneficial programs in science, culture, and nonmilitary trade. Members view these policies as contributing to liberalized emigration, enhanced human rights, increased exchange of information, and freedom to travel for peoples of all nations.

Whereas organizational affiliations are listed for identification purposes, each official member serves in his or her individual capacity. The other category of participation is that of supporter.

Nonpartisan and tax-exempt, the East-West Committee is funded by its members, foundations, corporations and other concerned individuals.

To drive the probability of nuclear war to zero is the historic imperative. In order to conduct an educational program of sufficient scope, substantial funding needs must be met. No effort should be spared; no support withheld. We welcome, and need, your participation.

CONTRIBUTIONS ARE TAX-DEDUCTIBLE

NEGOTIATION, NOT CONFRONTATION

The East-West Committee believes the security of the United States and that of our allies is best served by reducing tensions between East and West, and in particular between the United States and the Soviet Union to avert thermonuclear war.

We fully appreciate the fundamental differences separating the two societies, yet it is clear that areas of mutual self-interest exist—most significantly in nuclear weapons control and reduction; but also in nonmilitary trade and a variety of cultural, educational, scientific and technological exchanges. No matter how rigid the Soviet system, it is not immune to political accommodation, exposure to diversity, effective communication, and world opinion.

We believe that confrontational policies by either great power invite dangers neither nation can risk. Nor can the world.

In that spirit we support a stable military balance and fair and verifiable agreements to limit and reduce nuclear weapons. We reject the concept of "limited" nuclear war by either power and oppose development of nuclear weapons systems which undermine the principle of deterrence. In the area of nonmilitary trade, we believe undue unilateral restrictions should be removed and disincentives avoided.

We believe the aforementioned principles contribute to our national interest, our economic well-being, and above all, our ultimate survival.

PRECEDENTS FOR HOPE

Americans hear much about "perceived threats," "present dangers," and "windows of vulnerability," but rarely about existing areas of cooperation such as:

- 396* basic agreements, amendments and extensions in force between the U.S. and Eastern European countries in such fields as atomic energy, narcotic drugs, postal services, education, investment guarantees, finance and tax arrangements, weather.
- 16 international arms control agreements which are in force and to which the United States and the Soviet Union are parties—Geneva Protocol, Antarctic Treaty, "Hot Line" Agreement, Limited Test Ban Treaty, Outer Space Treaty, Treaty Prohibiting Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, Nonproliferation Treaty, "Hot Line" Modernization Agreement, ABM Treaty, Standing Consultative Commission for SALT Agreement, Basic Principles of Negotiations on the Further Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms Agreement, Biological Weapons Convention, Protocol to ABM Treaty, Environmental Modification Convention. Additionally, three international arms control treaties have been negotiated and initialled by the United States and the Soviet Union but remain unratified—Threshold Test Ban Treaty, Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty (PNE), and the SALT II Treaty.
- 75 US-USSR bilateral agreements on matters of environmental cooperation, health and housing, agriculture and energy, maritime affairs, trade and commerce, aviation.
- Over 500 major U.S. corporations on record as having signed agreements or negotiated with the Soviet Union for commodity sales and scientific and technological exchanges on nonstrategic goods. Some of the giants include **American Express, ARMCO, Capitol Records, Coca Cola, Control Data, Corning Glass Works, Dow, Dresser Industries, EXXON, Firestone Tire & Rubber, General Mills, Gulf Oil, Honeywell, Hewlett Packard, IBM, Philip Morris, PepsiCo, Tenneco; Time magazine, U.S. Steel.**

These agreements—themselves advantageous—buttress current political negotiations and provide a positive atmosphere for future ones.

THE FACTS, PLEASE

There are indeed real differences between the United States and the Soviet Union. Yet there is a tendency to overemphasize and oversimplify negative aspects of US-Soviet affairs. Because the relationship is such a crucial one, it is essential that the public have access to balanced and reliable information.


Armed with facts, Americans are in a better position to exercise their judgment on the best possible course of action for the peace and security of our nation. Accordingly, the East-West Committee and its members

- hold press briefings and conferences
- publish books and monographs
- meet with editorial boards of major newspapers and magazines
- appear on television and radio
- write op-ed pieces and magazine articles
- testify before Congress upon request
- sponsor films and ads
- consult with the legislative and executive branches of the government
- publish and disseminate *East/West OUT-LOOK* to over 5,000 media outlets

Members also write timely reports on particular aspects of U.S.-Soviet affairs for the public, the press, Congress, and the executive branch of the government and participate in seminars, conferences and briefings to clarify the issues and to promote a depth and accuracy of understanding.

Of transcendent importance, each American must have adequate means to assess the implications of the unprecedented potential for destroying ourselves, our adversaries, our friends, and the world.

PROMINENT AMERICANS IN ACCORD



GEORGE F. KENNAN
Former U.S. Ambassador to
the Soviet Union;
Diplomatic Historian




ROBERT S. McNAMARA
Former Secretary of Defense;
Former Pres., The World Bank




DONALD M. KENDALL
Chairman, PepsiCo, Inc.




ESTHER PETERSON
Former Special Assistant to
the President on
Consumer Interests



JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH
Former U.S. Ambassador;
Prof. Emeritus, Harvard Univ.



ROBERT D. SCHMIDT
Vice Chairman,
Control Data Corporation



DONALD F. McHENRY
Former U.S. Permanent
Representative to
the United Nations



W. AVERELL HARRIMAN
Former U.S. Ambassador to the
Soviet Union; former Gov.
of New York

The 290 members of the American Committee on East-West Accord are prominent Americans—Republicans, Democrats and Independents—experienced in the fields of diplomacy, industry, public

... AN UNUSUAL ALLIANCE



ELMER B. STAATS
Former Comptroller General
of the U.S.; President,
Harry S. Truman Foundation



THORNTON F. BRADSHAW
Chairman and Chief
Executive Officer,
RCA Corporation




JEROME B. WIESNER
President Emeritus, M.I.T.;
former Presidential
Science Adviser




GLENN E. WATTS
President, Communications
Workers of America



HERBERT F. YORK
Former U.S. Ambassador;
Former Dir. Def. Research
& Engineering, OSD



JOHN CULVER
Former U.S. Senator (D-IA);
Attorney, Arent Fox Kintner
Plotkin & Kahn



JOHN D. STEINBRUNER
Dir., Foreign Policy Studies
Program, Brookings Institution



VICE ADMIRAL JOHN MARSHALL LEE
U.S. Navy (Ret.) Former Commander,
Seventh Fleet, Amphibious Force in
Western Pacific; Former Asst. Dir., A.C.D.A.

interest affairs, defense, labor, arms control, economics foreign policy, science and the news media. Many have represented the United States in direct negotiations with the East in their professional careers.

PROMINENT AMERICANS IN ACCORD



THE REV. THEODORE M. HESBURGH, C.S.C.
President,
University of Notre Dame



GEORGE W. BALL
Former Under Secretary
of State; Senior Managing
Director, Lehman Brothers
Kuhn Loeb, Inc.



GEORGE B. KISTIAKOWSKY
Science Adviser to
President Eisenhower;
Prof. Emeritus, Harvard Univ.




RUTH CLUSEN
Former President, League of
Women Voters of the U.S.



PHILIP M. KLUTZNICK
Former Secretary of Commerce



HARRISON SALISBURY
Specialist, Soviet Affairs,
The New York Times



TOWNSEND HOOPES
Former Under Secretary
of the Air Force



WILLIAM ATTWOOD
Former U.S. Ambassador;
Author

It is precisely the composition and range of expertise within the American Committee which enable us to respond to the growing need for public information on East-West relations—reliable, experienced, and bal-

... AN UNUSUAL ALLIANCE




JOHN V. JAMES
Chairman and President,
Dresser Industries




ADMIRAL NOEL GAYLER
U.S. Navy (Ret.) Former Dir., National
Security Agency; Former Commander-
in-Chief, all U.S. Forces, Pacific
(CINCPAC)



MARVIN L. GOLDBERGER
President, California Institute
of Technology




J. W. FULBRIGHT
Attorney; Former Chairman,
Senate Foreign Relations
Committee



DOUGLAS A. FRASER
President, U.A.W.



RALPH EARLE II
Former Director, Arms Control
and Disarmament Agency



ARMAND HAMMER
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer,
Occidental Petroleum, Inc.



SPYROS S. SKOURAS
President,
Prudential Lines, Inc.

anced information.

How many Americans know that May 23, 1982 marks the tenth year of cooperation between American and Russian scientists on cancer research...

PROMINENT AMERICANS IN ACCORD



STANLEY RESOR
Former Under Secretary of
Defense; former Secretary of
the Army




JACOB K. JAVITS
Former U.S. Senator (R-NY);
Attorney, Trubin Sillcocks
Edelman & Knapp



BISHOP ROY C. NICHOLS
Resident Bishop,
New York Area,
United Methodist Church



MARIETTA TREE
Former U.S. Ambassador




STANLEY HOFFMANN
Chairman, Center for European
Studies, Harvard Univ.



PAUL DOTY
Dir., Center for Science and
International Affairs,
Harvard University



ROBERT V. ROOSA
Former Under Secretary
of the Treasury;
Brown Bros., Harriman Co.



HODDING CARTER III
Former Assistant Secretary
of State; Anchorman and
Chief Correspondent, PBS-TV
"Inside Story"

... or realize that Soviet trade with the West came to 28.5 billion dollars in 1980 ... or that an average 80,000 US tourists visited the Soviet Union annually between 1976 and 1979.

... AN UNUSUAL ALLIANCE




GLORIA E. LEMOS
Vice President, Coca-Cola Co.




LANDRUM BOLLING
Former Chairman and Chief Executive
Officer, Council on Foundations;
Research Prof. of Diplomacy,
Georgetown Univ.



C. WILLIAM VERITY
Chairman, ARMCO, Inc.




CYRIL E. BLACK
Dir., Center for
International Studies,
Princeton University




ROBERT SCALAPINO
Dir., Inst. of East Asian Studies,
Univ. of California at Berkeley



LEWIS BRANSCOMB
Vice President &
Chief Scientist, IBM



LEONARD WOODCOCK
Former U.S. Ambassador to
P.R.C.; Pres. Emeritus, U.A.W.





ADAM YARMOLINSKY
Attorney; Former Special
Asst. to Secretary of Defense

For full listing of membership, please see following pages. Officers and members of the Board of Directors appear on the back panel.


EAST/WEST COMMITTEE - COMMUNICATING...



Film Premiere, "Survival... or Suicide"
W. Averell Harriman, member
John Kenneth Galbraith, Co-Chairman
Donald M. Kendall, Co-Chairman



East/West OUTLOOK—a bimonthly publication for members, media, diplomatic corps, and Congress; \$12 per year




Carl Marcy




Annual Meeting 1981
Robert D. Schmidt, President; John Kenneth Galbraith, Co-Chairman; and Jeanne Vaughn Mattison, Co-Director




\$3.50 per book



George F. Kennan,
Co-Chairman



\$3.50 per book



Fred Warner Neal,
Executive Vice President

MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON EAST-WEST ACCORD

ALLINGTON, JOHN R. Vice President, Instrumentation Specialties Company

ANAGNOS, ARIS President, Real Estate Dynamics, Inc.

APTER, DAVID President, David Apter & Associates

ARBOGAST, STEPHEN V. Treasurer, ESSO Central America

ASHER, THOMAS R. Attorney at Law, Washington, DC

ASHMORE, HARRY S. Pulitzer Prizewinner for Editorial Writing

ATTWOOD, WILLIAM Author; Former US Ambassador; Former Chairman of the Board, Newsday

BAER, FREDERICK E. President, Paper Converting Machine Company

BALL, GEORGE W. Former Under Secretary of State; Senior Managing Director, Lehman Brothers Kuhn Loeb, Inc.

BALTIMORE, DAVID Professor of Biology, M.I.T.; Director, Whitehead Institute for Biomedical Research

BARD, ROBERT L. Professor of Law, University of Connecticut

BARDOS, GEORGE K. Vice President, Govt. Programs & International Trade Relations, Control Data Corporation

BARNETT, ROBERT W. Resident Associate, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace

BARTON, ARDY Attorney, Santa Barbara, CA

BENNETT, ROY US Correspondent to the London *Tribune*; Noblemet International, Inc.

BENTON, CHARLES President, Films Incorporated

BENTON, MARJORIE C. Board Member, Arms Control Association; International Editorial Board, *The Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*

BERES, LOUIS RENE Professor of Political Science, Purdue University

BERGER, MEYER Chairman, M. Berger Company

BERMAN, HAROLD J. Story Professor of Law, Harvard Law School

BERNBACH, WILLIAM Chairman of the Executive Committee, Doyle Dane Bernbach Inc.

BLACK, CYRIL E. Director, Center for International Studies, Princeton University

BLIER, BERNARD B. Management Consultant, Scranton, PA

BOEHM, ROBERT L. Attorney at Law, New York, NY

BOLLING, LANDRUM Former Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Council on Foundations; Research Prof. of Diplomacy, Georgetown Univ.

BOOKMAN, GEORGE B. Public Relations Consultant

BOWE, JAMES J. Vice President, Business Advisors, Inc., Control Data Corporation

BOWEN, HOWARD R. Professor of Economics, Claremont Graduate School; Former President, The University of Iowa

BRADLEY, DAVID, M.D. Teacher; writer; Author of "No Place to Hide" 1948, on the Bikini bomb test

BRADLEY, WILLIAM L. President, The Edward W. Hazen Foundation

BRADSHAW, THORNTON F. Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, RCA Corporation

BRANSCOMB, LEWIS Vice President and Chief Scientist, IBM Corporation

BROADWATER, ROBERT J. Associate of MEGA, Atlanta, Georgia

BROOKE, JOEL I. The Fund for Peace

BROWN, EDMUND G. Former Governor of California; Partner, Ball Hunt Hart Brown & Baerwitz

BROWN, HARRISON Director, Resource Systems Institute, East-West Center

CALDWELL, LAWRENCE T. Chairman, Political Science Department, Occidental College

CARTER, HODDING III Former Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs; Anchorman and Chief Correspondent, PBS "Inside Story"

CHAMBERS, JOHN Vice President, SATRA Corporation

CHAPMAN, MARGARET H. Special Assistant to the Directors, American Committee on East-West Accord

CHASE, STUART Writer

CHILEWICH, SIMON President, Chilewich Corporation

CHURCH, FRANK Former U.S. Senator (D-ID); Former Chairman Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Attorney, Whitman & Ransom

CLARK, DICK Former U.S. Senator (D-IA); Senior Fellow, Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies

CLARK, WILLARD G. President, Worldwide Sires, Inc.

CLEMENS, WALTER C. Professor of Political Science, Boston University

CLUBB, O. EDMUND Foreign Service Officer (Ret.); Author, *China and Russia: The Great Game*

CLUSEN, RUTH Former President, League of Women Voters of the U.S.; Former Assistant Secretary, Department of Energy

COHEN, STEPHEN F. Director, Russian Studies Program, Princeton University

COMPTON, JAMES R. President, Compton Foundation, Inc.

COMPTON, RANDOLPH P. Chairman of the Board, Compton Foundation, Inc.

COOMBS, WALTER P. Professor of American Studies, California State Polytechnic University

COX, ARTHUR MACY Author; Consultant; Columnist

CRAWFORD, WILLIAM R. Former U.S. Ambassador

CROSBY, HARRIET Jungian Counselor; Policy Committee, Friends Committee on National Legislation

CROWNHART-VAUGHAN, E.A.P. Historian, Portland, Oregon

CULVER, JOHN Former U.S. Senator (D-IA) and member Senate Armed Services Committee; Attorney, Arent Fox Kintner Plotkin & Kahn

CUSHMAN, EDWARD L. Clarence Hilberry University Professor, Wayne State University; Honorary Chairman, Detroit Council on World Affairs; Director and Former Vice President, American Motors

DAVIDSON, WILLIAM Director, Institute for Psychiatry and Foreign Affairs

DE VRIES, D. Oilfield Systems, Inc, Houston, Texas

DOCTOROW, GILBERT S. ITT Europe, Brussels

DONAGHUE, HUGH P. Vice President and Assistant to the Chief Executive Officer, Control Data Corporation

DOTY, PAUL Director, Center for Science & International Affairs, Harvard University

DOUGLAS, KIRK Actor

DRELL, SIDNEY D. Deputy Director, Stanford Linear Accelerator Center

DUDLEY, TILFORD E. President, Property Management & Maintenance

DUDMAN, RICHARD Former Bureau Chief, *St. Louis Post Dispatch*;

WDEA Radio, Maine

EARLE, RALPH II Former Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; Attorney at Law

EDEY, HELEN M.D.,

EDMONDS, HELEN G. Adjunct Professor of History, North Carolina Central University; Board of Directors, United Negro College Fund

EICHNER, WALTER Manager, Public Relations Services, Atlantic Richfield Company

FAIK, RICHARD A. Albert G. Milbank Professor of International Law and Practice, Center for International Studies, Princeton University

FELD, BERNARD T. Head, Division of Nuclear and Particle Physics, M.I.T.; Editor-in-Chief, *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*

FENTON, RICHARD C. President, Fenton International, Inc.

FILNER, JOSEPH President, Noblemet International, Inc.

FISHER, ROGER Professor of Law, Harvard University

FLEET, JULIA B. La Jolla, California

FORREST, H.S. Senior Vice President, Control Data Corporation

FORRESTAL, MICHAEL V. Former President, US-USSR Trade & Economic Council, Inc.; Partner, Shearman and Sterling

FRANK, JEROME D. Professor Emeritus of Psychiatry, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine

FRASER, DOUGLAS A. President, U.A.W.

FREUND, GERALD Vice President, John D. and Catherine MacArthur Foundation

FULBRIGHT, J.W. Former U.S. Senator (D-AR); former Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Attorney

FULLER, ROBERT Former President, Oberlin College

GALBRAITH, JOHN KENNETH Former U.S. Ambassador; Professor Emeritus of Economics, Harvard University

GANS, CURTIS Writer; Consultant

GARTHOFF, RAYMOND L. Former U.S. Ambassador; Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution

GAYLER, ADMIRAL NOEL (USN-Ret.) Former Commander-in-Chief, all U.S. Forces, Pacific (CINCPAC); Former Director, National Security Agency

GEORGE, ALEXANDER L. Professor of Political Science, Stanford University

GILLETTE, PHILIP S. Associate Professor, Old Dominion University

GILLIN, DONALD G. Professor of History and Director, East Asian Studies, Vassar College

GLENNON, MICHAEL J. Former Legal Counsel, Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Assoc. Prof. of Law, University of Cincinnati

GOLDBERGER, MARVIN L. President, California Institute of Technology

GOLDMAN, MARSHALL I. Professor of Economics, Wellesley College; Associate Director, Russian Research Center, Harvard University

GOODMAN, RABBI ARNOLD M. Minneapolis, Minnesota

GRIPP, RICHARD Professor of Political Science, San Diego State University

GROSSMAN, JEROME President, Council for a Livable World

GRULIOW, LEO Editor Emeritus, *The Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, The Ohio State University

GUERTNER, GARY Professor of Political Science, California State University (on leave US Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA)

HALTZEL, MICHAEL Research Associate—International, Russell Reynolds Associates

HAMMER, ARMAND Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Occidental Petroleum, Inc.

HARRIMAN, W. AVERELL Former U.S. Ambassador to U.S.S.R.; Former Governor, New York

HARRIS, JOHN A. IV Chairman, USA Club of Rome

HARTT, JULIAN N. Professor Emeritus of Religious Studies, University of Virginia

HASKELL, FLOYD Former U.S. Senator (D-Colorado)

HEER, NANCY Visiting Professor of Government, Wheaton College, Norton, MA

HERRICK, SCOTT Miami, Florida

HESBURGH, THE REV. THEODORE M., C.S.C. President, University of Notre Dame

HESS, JOHN H. JR. Psychoanalyst; Professor

HIGMAN, HOWARD Professor of Sociology, University of Colorado

HOFFMAN, GEORGE W. Professor of Geography, University of Texas

HOFFMAN, HARRISON B. W. Dean of Studies, Greenwich Country Day School

HOFFMAN, LOUISE S. Greenwich, CT

HOFFMANN, STANLEY Chairman, Center for European Studies, Harvard University

HOFFMEISTER, STANLEY Clinical Professor of Plastic Surgery, Albany Medical College, NY

HOGLE, GEORGE Professor of Psychiatry, Stanford University

HOLZMAN, FRANKLYN D. Professor of Economics, Tufts University; Fellow, Harvard Russian Research Center; Fellow, Kennan Institute for Russian Studies

HOOPES, TOWNSEND Former Under Secretary of the Air Force; President, The Association of American Publishers

HORNOR, DE WITT Citibank (Retired)

HOUGH, JERRY Professor of Political Science, Duke University

HOWARD, JOHN R. Former President, Lewis and Clark College

HUNSAKER, BARRY Executive Vice President, El Paso LNG Company

HUNTER, HOLLAND Professor of Economics, Haverford College

HYMES, W. FREDERICK Lederle Laboratories; Biochemistry

IRVINE, MRS. THOMAS St. Paul, Minnesota

JACOBSON, JEROME Vice Chairman, Burroughs Corporation

JAMES, JOHN V. Chairman and President, Dresser Industries

JAMGOTCH, NISH, JR. Professor of Political Science, University of North Carolina-Charlotte

JAVITS, JACOB K. Former U.S. Senator (R-NY); Attorney, Trubin Sillcocks Edelman & Knapp

JESSUP, PHILIP C. Former U.S. Ambassador; Former Judge, International Court of Justice

JOHNSON, ALIA Editor, *Evolutionary Blues*

JOHNSON, BYRON L. Regent and Professor of Economics, University of Colorado at Denver

KAISER, PHILIP M. Former U.S. Ambassador

KANG, SUGWON Professor of Political Science, Hartwick College

KAPLAN, JUSTIN Historian and Author; Pulitzer Prize, Biography

KEELEY, JAMES HUGH Foreign Service Officer (ret.); Career Minister of U.S. (ret.)

KENDALL, DONALD M. Chairman, PepsiCo, Inc.

KENNAN, GEORGE F. Former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union; Professor Emeritus, Institute for Advanced Studies, Princeton, NJ

KISTIAKOWSKY, GEORGE B. Former Science Adviser to President Eisenhower; Professor Emeritus of Chemistry, Harvard University

KLUTZNICK, PHILIP M. Former Secretary of Commerce; former President, World Jewish Congress

KORRY, EDWARD Former U.S. Ambassador; Visiting Scholar at Center for International Affairs, Harvard University

KUHLMAN, J.A. Director, James F. Byrnes International Center, University of South Carolina-Columbia; Executive Director, International Studies Association

LaFEBER, WALTER Professor of History, Cornell University
LALL, BETTY GOETZ Dept. of Political Science, Cornell University
LAMB, EDWARD Banker; Industrialist; President, Lamb Enterprises
LaROCQUE, REAR ADMIRAL GENE R. USN (Ret.)
LASCH, ROBERT Author; Pulitzer Prizewinner for Editorial Writing
LEE, VICE ADMIRAL JOHN MARSHALL (USN-Ret.); Former Commander, Seventh Fleet Amphibious Force in Western Pacific; Former Assistant Director, A.C.D.A.
LEMANN, LUCY New York, NY
LEMONS, GLORIA E. Vice President, The Coca-Cola Company
LEONTIEF, WASSILY Nobel Laureate; Director, Institute for Economic Analysis, NY University
LEWIS, MARK Former Public Affairs Officer, U.S. Information Agency; Program Director, "Scandinavia Today"
LINEBAUGH, DAVID Former Foreign Service Officer; Writer
LOGAN, DOUGLAS O. Editor, Dodd Mead & Company, Inc.
LOWN, BERNARD President, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, Inc.; Professor of Cardiology, Harvard School of Public Health
MAGUIRE, JOHN President, Claremont University Center, Claremont, California
MAKUSH, WALTER S. Vice President and Area Director, Westinghouse Electric Corporation
MANNHEIMER, ROBERT E. Attorney, Dickinson Throckmorton Parker Mannheimer & Raife
MARCUSS, STANLEY J. Partner, Milbank Tweed Hadley & McCloy
MARCY, CARL Former Chief of Staff, Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Attorney at Law
MARTIN, EDWIN M. Former U.S. Ambassador; Chairman, Consultative Group on Food Production and Investment in Developing Countries
MATTHIAS, WILLARD C. Former Member, Board of National Estimates, CIA
MATTISON, JEANNE VAUGHN Co-Director, American Committee on East-West Accord
McCARTHY, EUGENE Former U.S. Senator (D-MN)
McELWAIN, SCOTT Professor of Political Science, University of San Francisco
McGOVERN, GEORGE Former U.S. Senator (D-SD); Chairman, Americans for Common Sense
McHENRY, DONALD F. Former U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations
McLANE-BRADLEY, ELISABETH Trustee, University of N.H. system
McNAMARA, ROBERT S. Former Secretary of Defense; Former President, The World Bank
McSWEENEY, WILLIAM President, Occidental International Corp.
MENDELSON, EVERETT Professor of the History of Science, Harvard University
MENNINGER, ANN CATHERINE Franconia, New Hampshire
MILLS, SHELDON T. Former U.S. Ambassador
MONTGOMERY, BEN C. Executive Vice President, Pipeline Operations, Crutcher Resources Corp.
MORGAN, CHARLES, JR. Attorney, Charles Morgan, Jr. & Associates, Chartered
MORGAN, PATRICK Professor of Political Science, Washington State University
MOTT, MARYANNE Philanthropist
MOTT, STEWART RAWLINGS
MULLER, JAMES E. Assistant Professor of Medicine, Peter Brent Brigham Hospital
NAKONECHNY, ERIKH Manager of Materials & Logistics, Overseas Project, Dresser Industries
NEAL, FRED WARNER Chairman, International Relations Faculty, Claremont Graduate School
NEALE, ROBERT Robert Neale Real Estate Company
NEEL, JAMES V. Lee R. Dice University Professor of Human Genetics, University of Michigan
NEWSOM, DAVID D. Former Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs; Director of the Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, Georgetown University
NICHOLS, BISHOP ROY C. Resident Bishop, New York Area, United Methodist Church
NILES, HENRY E. Chairman, Business Executives Move for New National Priorities
NYARY, NICHOLAS Consultant
OSBORN, EARL D. President Emeritus, Institute for World Order
OTTMAR, JEROME President, Amtel-Amca, Inc.
OZTEML, ARA Chairman of the Board, SATRA Corporation

PARTEN, J.R. Houston, Texas
PASCHKE, STEPHEN Associate Director, Institute for the Study of World Politics
PASTOR, MARGARET McNAMARA Technical Staff, Mitre Corporation
PATTERSON, HUGH B. Publisher, *Arkansas Gazette*
PATTON, JAMES President Emeritus, National Farmers Union
PEALE, PATRICIA Cos Cob, CT
PEDOTTI, HELEN Gaviota, California
PETERSON, ESTHER Consumer Advocate; Former Special Assistant to the President on Consumer Interests
PETERSON, SOPHIA Professor of Political Science, West Virginia University
PETROV, VLADIMIR Professor of International Affairs, The George Washington University
PHILLIPS, GIFFORD Former Associate Publisher, *Nation*
PIEL, GERARD Publisher, *Scientific American*
PISAR, SAMUEL Author; Attorney, Pisar & Huhs
POKORNY, GENE Executive Vice President, Cambridge Reports, Inc.
POST, AVERY D. President, United Church of Christ
PRICE, CHARLES C. Former President, American Chemical Society
PRILL, GEORGE President, George C. Prill and Associates, Inc.; Former President, Lockheed International Company
PROEHL, PAUL O. Former Vice Chancellor, UCLA; President, International College
RATHJENS, GEORGE Prof. of Political Science, M.I.T.
RAVENAL, EARL Adjunct Professor of American Foreign Policy, School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University
RAY, JACK H. President, Tennessee Gas Transmission (Tenneco)
REGAS, GEORGE F. (The Rev. Father) Rector, All Saints Church, Pasadena, CA
REISCHAUER, EDWIN O. Former U.S. Ambassador; University Professor Emeritus, Harvard University
RENO, ROBERT H. Partner, Orr & Reno
RESOR, STANLEY Former Under Secretary of Defense for Policy; Former Secretary of the Army; Partner, Deboroise Plimpton Lyons & Gates
RIBICOFF, ABRAHAM Former U.S. Senator (D-CT); Special Counsel, Kaye Scholar Fierman Hays & Handler
RIESMAN, DAVID, JR. Henry Ford II Professor of Social Sciences Emeritus, Harvard University
ROBISON, OLIN President, Middlebury College
ROME, HOWARD R. Mayo Clinic President Emeritus; Past President, World Association of Psychiatrists
ROOSA, ROBERT V. Former Under Secretary of the Treasury; Brown Bros. Harriman, Co.
ROSENBERG, HELENE New York, NY
ROSENBERG, MARVIN Chairman, Cameo Curtains, Inc.
SALISBURY, HARRISON E. Specialist, Soviet Affairs; Former Associate Editor, *New York Times*
SALK, ERWIN A. President, Salk Ward & Salk, Inc.
SALTER, LEONARD M. Wasserman and Salter, Counsellors at Law
SANDLER, AKE Professor Emeritus of Political Science, California State University at Los Angeles
SANFORD, TERRY President, Duke University; Former Governor of North Carolina
SCALAPINO, ROBERT Director of the Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California at Berkeley
SCHACTER, MARVIN President, Maris Management Corporation, Los Angeles; Member ACLU National Board of Directors
SCHEUER, ROBERT Executive Vice President, Scheuer International Trading, Inc.
SCHEUER, SIDNEY H. Scheuer and Company
SCHLOSSBERG, STEPHEN Washington Counsel, U.A.W.
SCHMIDT, ROBERT D. Vice Chairman of the Board, Control Data Corporation
SCOTT, HAROLD B. Chairman of the Board, Givaudan Corporation; Former President, US-USSR Trade and Economic Council
SCOVILLE, HERBERT, JR. Former Deputy Director for Research, CIA; Former Assistant Director for Science & Technology, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; President, Arms Control Association
SHIPLEY, RICHARD President, American Casein Company
SHRIVER, SARGENT Former U.S. Ambassador; Attorney, Fried Frank Harris Shriver & Kampelman
SINGER, J. DAVID Professor of Political Science, University of Michigan
SIVARD, RUTH Economist; Author, *World Military and Social Expenditures*
SKOURAS, SPYROS S. President and Chief Executive Officer, Prudential Lines, Inc.

SPENCER, LOUISA C. New York, NY
SPENCER, WILLIAM C. Vice President, Trans-International Management
SPIRO, WALTER Chairman, Spiro & Associates, Inc.
STAATS, ELMER B. Former Comptroller General of the U.S.; President, Harry S. Truman Foundation
STANLEY, C. MAXWELL President, Stanley Foundation
STARR, S. FREDERICK Vice President for Academic Affairs, Tulane University, former Secretary, Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies
STEINBRUNER, JOHN D. Director, Foreign Policy Studies Program, Brookings Institution
STERN, FRITZ Provost and Seth Low Professor of History, Columbia University
STERN, PHILIP Author
STEVENS, ADLAI Former Senator (D-IL); Attorney, Mayer Brown & Platt
STILL, JOSEPH Physician-Scientist, Personal Preventive Medicine Group
STOLLER, ROBERT J. M.D., Department of Psychiatry, School of Medicine, UCLA
STONE, JEREMY J. Director, Federation of American Scientists
STOVER, CARL F. Scholar in Residence, National Academy of Public Administration
STOWELL, CHRISTOPHER E. President, WJS Inc., Washington, DC
STROEBEL, PAUL G. Director, International Business Relations, The Dow Chemical Co.
SYMINGTON, STUART Former Secretary of the Air Force; Former Senator (D-MO)
THOMPSON, KENNETH W. Director, White Burkett Miller Center of Public Affairs, University of Virginia
THOMPSON, WILLIAM P. Stated Clerk of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
TILLMAN, SETH Director of Policy and Issues, Americans for Common Sense
TREE, MARIETTA Former U.S. Ambassador
TSCHBOTARIOFF, FLORENCE B. Lawrenceville, NJ
TSCHBOTARIOFF, GREGORY P. Consulting Engineer (Ret.)
TSIPIS, KOSTA Associate Director, Program in Science and Technology for International Security, and Senior Research Scientist, Department of Physics, M.I.T.
TUCKER, ROBERT C. Professor of Politics, Princeton University
TUNNEY, JOHN Former Senator (D-CA); Attorney, Manatt Phelps Rothenberg Manley & Tunney
ULLMAN, RICHARD H. Prof. of International Affairs, Princeton Univ.
VERITY, C. WILLIAM Chairman, ARMCO Incorporated; Co-Chairman, US-USSR Trade & Economic Council
VON LAUE, THEODORE Professor of History, Clark University
WADSWORTH, JAMES J. Former U.S. Ambassador
WALLIN, FRANKLIN W. President, Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana
WALTZ, KENNETH N. Professor of Political Science, Univ. of CA
WARBURG, JOAN President, The Bydale Foundation
WATTS, GLENN E. President, Communication Workers of America
WEISS, BERNARD S. Former Vice President, Gimbel Bros, Inc.
WHITE, RALPH Professor Emeritus, George Washington University
WHITING, ALLEN S. Professor of Political Science, Univ. of Michigan
WIESNER, JEROME B. Former Presidential Science Adviser; President Emeritus M.I.T.
WILCOCK, JAMES W. Chairman, President, and Chief Executive Officer, Joy Manufacturing Co.
WILLENS, HAROLD Chairman, Factory Equipment Corporation
WILLIAMS, MURAT W. Former U.S. Ambassador
WILSON, ABRAHAM Partner, Kadel Wilson & Potts
WILSON, EDWARD T. Vice President, Multinational Division, Riggs National Bank
WOLFE, GREGORY B. President, Florida International University
WOODCOCK, LEONARD Former U.S. Ambassador, President Emeritus, United Auto Workers
YARMOLINSKY, ADAM Attorney; Former Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense
YORK, HERBERT F. Former U.S. Ambassador; former Director, Defense Research and Engineering, OSD; Professor of Physics and Director of the Program in Science, Technology and Public Affairs, Univ. of CA, S.D.
ZACHRISSON, CARL U. Adjunct Professor of International Relations, Claremont Graduate School
ZAGORIA, DONALD S. Professor of Government, City University of New York; Soviet Foreign Policy and Sino-Soviet Relations, Columbia Univ.
ZELMAN, VIKI Viki List Zelman Fund
ZIFFREN, PAUL Attorney, Los Angeles, CA

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

WILLIAM ATTWOOD, Former US Ambassador; Author
GEORGE W. BALL, Senior Managing Director, Lehman Brothers Kuhn Loeb, Inc.; Former Under Secretary of State
MEYER BERGER, Chairman, M. Berger Co.
THOMAS CABOT, SR., Chairman Emeritus, Cabot Corp.
HODDING CARTER III, Chief Correspondent, PBS-T.V. (Inside Story); Former Assistant Secretary of State
SIMON CHILEWICH, President, Chilewich Corporation
STEPHEN F. COHEN, Dir., Russian Studies Program, Princeton University
ARTHUR MACY COX, Author; Columnist
JOHN CULVER, Partner, Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin, Kahn; Former U.S. Senator (D-Iowa)
TILFORD E. DUDLEY, President, Property Management & Maint.
JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH, Former US Ambassador; Professor Emeritus, Harvard University
CURTIS GANS, Writer, Consultant
ADMIRAL NOEL GAYLER (USN-Ret.), Former Commander-in-Chief, all U.S. Forces, Pacific (CINCPAC) and Director, National Security Agency
ARMAND HAMMER, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Occidental Petroleum Inc.
THEODORE M. HESBURGH, C.S.C., Ex-Officio Member; President, University of Notre Dame
TOWNSEND HOOPES, President, Association of American Publishers; Former Under Secretary of the Air Force
DONALD M. KENDALL, Chairman, PepsiCo, Inc.
GEORGE F. KENNAN, Former US Ambassador to the Soviet Union; Diplomatic Historian
VICE ADMIRAL JOHN MARSHALL LEE, USN (Ret.)
GLORIA LEMOS, Vice President, Coca-Cola Co.
CARL MARCY, Former Chief of Staff, Senate Foreign Relations Committee
JEANNE VAUGHN MATTISON, Director, American Committee on East-West Accord
ROBERT S. McNAMARA, Former Secretary of Defense; Former President, The World Bank
WILLIAM McSWEENEY, President, Occidental International Corporation
STEWART RAWLINGS MOTT
FRED WARNER NEAL, Former Chairman, International Relations Faculty, Claremont Graduate School
JEROME OTTMAR, President, Amtel-Amca, Inc.
ARA OZTEML, President and Chairman, SATRA Corporation
AVERY POST, President, United Church of Christ
STEPHEN SCHLOSSBERG, Washington Counsel, UAW
ROBERT D. SCHMIDT, Vice Chairman of the Board, Control Data Corporation
HAROLD B. SCOTT, Chairman, Givaudan Corporation; Former President, US-USSR Trade and Economic Council
MRS. DUNCAN M. SPENCER, New York
MRS. JAMES P. WARBURG, President, The Bydale Foundation
JEROME B. WIESNER, President Emeritus, M.I.T.; Former Presidential Science Advisor
LEONARD WOODCOCK, President Emeritus, UAW; Former Ambassador, People's Republic of China



American Committee on East-West Accord

George F. Kennan
Honorary Co-Chairman

John Kenneth Galbraith

Donald M. Kendall

Co-Chairmen

President

Robert D. Schmidt

Executive

Vice-President

Fred Warner Neal

Vice-President

Stephen Schlossberg

Secretary-

Treasurer

Tilford E. Dudley

Director

Jeanne Vaughn Mattison

Chairman, General Nuclear Settlement
Admiral Noel Gayler (USN-Ret.)

Deputy Director

Editor, East-West Outlook

Special Assistant for East-West Trade

General Counsel

Office Manager

Executive Assistant

C. Grant Pendill, Jr.

Roland S. Homet, Jr.

Margaret H. Chapman

Thomas Asher

Shirleen Lewis

Lisa Audino

☐ Check enclosed to the American Committee on East-West Accord

Name

Affiliation

Address

City

State

Zip

Contributions are tax-deductible.

109 Eleventh Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003
(202) 546-1700



East-West OUTLOOK

Roland S. Homet, Jr., Editor

AMERICAN COMMITTEE
ON
EAST-WEST ACCORD
Publisher

109 Eleventh Street, S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20003

Assessing U.S.—Soviet Relations:

From the U.S. Senate	2
From the Soviet Embassy	6
From the American Committee	8

Communication With The Candidates:

The following letter was sent on March 15, 1984 to President Reagan and to each other major candidate for the Presidency:

Dear _____:

As (Commander-in-Chief) (candidate for the highest office of our land), you need no reminder that the prevention of nuclear war is the transcendent issue of our time. Yet discussions both official and public, popular and esoteric, have not produced results. To the contrary, the quality and quantity of nuclear weapons on both sides continue to go up, not down. Simultaneously Americans are demanding results that are significant and measurable.

The American Committee on East-West Accord is an educational organization comprised of prominent Americans who are specialists in diplomatic, military, scientific and trade aspects of U.S.-Soviet relations. Our approach is to advance tough-minded, pragmatic solutions aimed at improving our security.

To that end, we have developed a proposal for a "General Nuclear Settlement." The plan is at once verifiable, negotiable, and politically appealing. Given the stalemate in nuclear arms talks and the failure of piecemeal negotiations, we believe the time is right for a comprehensive nuclear settlement.

In keeping with the American Committee's nonpartisan policy, I am forwarding the enclosed proposal to each presidential candidate. Should you or anyone on your staff wish to hold discussions, we would be pleased to respond.

Respectfully,

Jeanne Vaughn Mattison
Director

Enclosures:
Brochure
General Nuclear Settlement

Ed. note: In June of 1984, follow-up platform planks on "U.S.-Soviet Relations and Nuclear Arms Control" were submitted on the American Committee's behalf to the Republican National Committee and the Democratic National Committee.

The American Committee on East-West Accord is incorporated as a tax-exempt, independent educational organization aimed at improving East-West relations, with special focus on U.S.-Soviet relations. The editor is responsible for the contents of *East-West Outlook*.

“Prospects and Possibilities”

Keynote Address by Senator Dale L. Bumpers (D.-AR)

Annual Meeting of the American Committee on East-West Accord

Washington, D.C., May 4, 1984



Senator Bumpers, now in his second term, is a former governor of Arkansas. He is a lawyer, farmer, and businessman, and currently serves as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Since Ambassador Kennan addressed you last year, and described our relationship with the Soviet Union as “dreadful and dangerous,” matters have become more dreadful and more dangerous.

[Senator Bumpers here reviewed the controversy over deployment of intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Europe, and criticized the Soviet decision to boycott the arms talks. He said that, in spite of the Administration’s hostility toward arms talks, it was the Soviet Union which “raised the ante” on intermediate range missiles in Europe by deploying their SS-20s. The Senator expressed surprise that some Soviet officials with whom he talked on a recent trip to the Soviet Union had never heard the Western point of view on the European missile question. And he expressed his disappointment that Soviet officials were unable to give him satisfactory assurances that they were not producing chemical weapons.]

He also expressed concern that planned U.S. missile deployments will soon exceed the limitations of the unratified, but mutually observed, SALT II agreement. Senator Bumpers has introduced a bipartisan Senate resolution to continue compliance with those limitations.]

But let me go to another matter. Aside from the insanity of the military aspects of this arms race, there are other compelling reasons to bring it under control.

The economies of both nations are threatened as never before by exorbitant defense expenditures. Our economic growth rate is presently as great as ever in our history—almost nine percent in the first quarter. But the deficits hang over us like a Damocles sword and portend an economic calamity in the near future. Defense expenditures have grown exponentially—101 percent—during Presi-

dent Reagan’s first term. Walter Lippmann said that the American people had never, and would never, sit still for huge defense expenditures in peacetime—but Walter Lippmann never met the Great Communicator.

When the CIA announced last year that they had erred in calculating Soviet defense expenditures since 1976—that the real increase was two percent annually, not four to five percent as previously reported, the White House asked, in effect, “Who’s the CIA?” So what had been portrayed—and continues to be portrayed—as the USSR’s fastest and biggest military build-up in history was refuted by William Casey’s CIA, but it has had no effect on the rhetoric of either the President or the Secretary of Defense.

Our own continuous build-up forces the Soviets to do the same, aggravating their problems with an already stagnant economy which suffers from a shortage of labor, shortage of consumer goods, shortage of cash reserves, and has had four out of five disastrous years agriculturally. Their ability to export oil, gold and weapons has not declined, but low prices and few buyers have limited their sales.

The Soviet capacity to store and transport grain is limited, extraction of minerals moves further and further inland with all the costs that entails, and in general their technology is inferior to that of most industrialized nations. Productivity is stagnant; per capita income was up only .1 percent in 1982 and is now declining. In the near future, Japan will overtake the U.S.S.R. in gross national product, thereby reducing the U.S.S.R.’s economy to third among the nations of the world.

We are in a game of “chicken” to see who can force more damage to the other’s economy by means of the arms race. It is a fool’s game, with no winners.

“There is a severe security risk as well as an economic penalty attached to undisciplined hostility.”

It also seems to me—no Sovietologist—that as relations deteriorate, the military build-up continues, and both sides look for areas of tests and confrontation, it is too much to expect that restraint on both sides will forever guarantee our survival. There is a severe security risk as well as an economic penalty attached to undisciplined hostility.

But the prospects for change are dim. Our *present* President is predicted by many to be our *next* President, and policy changes in the Soviet Union under Chairman Chernenko are highly unlikely. Since the revolution, every new leader in the U.S.S.R. has been five years older than his predecessor when he took office. Leadership has calcified and fundamental changes, sometimes naively hoped for in the West, are most unlikely.

In this country, the President will presumably continue to

base his policy on the proposition that every untoward event, perceived to be adverse to us, was hatched up in the Kremlin, and he will continue to use whatever rhetoric he perceives to be necessary to keep the defense budget on track.

We should never be naive about the Soviets or their intentions—but a doctrinaire posture, shorn of realism and understanding, perplexes our allies who have interests that are legitimate and not inimical to ours. We must recognize that we only damage ourselves and our allies with decisions such as the Russian pipeline. We must understand that the Soviets today genuinely distrust our intentions, and that we are doing a magnificent job of feeding that mistrust. The situation is dangerous in the extreme.

Can the Soviets be expected to believe that we want to raise the threshold for nuclear war, when our president promotes the deployment of first-strike weapons like the MX or seeks authorization of an anti-ballistic missile, which will—if deployed—violate the ABM Treaty? That no reliable source believes such a system will work is scarce comfort to the Soviets, nor to the American taxpayers. Scientists point out that even if such a system could be made 99 percent effective, enough warheads would still get through to commence the nuclear winter. Can the Soviets be expected to believe that we would never launch first, when we embark on an ABM system that they are likely to see as a shield against their retaliatory capability?

“All of this gives unfortunate credence to the President’s worst critics . . .”

Can we ask anyone to believe we are serious about meaningful reductions, while our strategic arms proposal allows for an actual increase in warheads? That is in the pending U.S. proposal—missile warheads would go down, but bomber warheads would triple.

All of this gives unfortunate credence to the President’s worst critics, who believe he is hell-bent upon, and will accept nothing short of, military superiority—the kind of superiority that causes nations to fold and surrender without a shot being fired.

It is a fact that the President has opposed every treaty we have ever signed with the Soviets; and while he deserves credit for his “no undercut” policy with respect to SALT II, it is difficult, as a result of his past unalterable and doc-

trinaire opposition, to accept on good faith his insistence that now he does indeed want a significant reduction in nuclear weapons.

It also bears recalling that our first offer at the Start talks proposed taking out well over half of the Soviet land-based ICBM’s. Since over 70 percent of Soviet warheads are on land-based ICBM’s, compared to our 25 percent, one can see why the Soviets dismissed the proposal as not serious.

In summary, there is little to be joyful about in the present or projected state of U.S.—U.S.S.R. relations. It seems to me that even should the Soviets suddenly return to the bargaining table and agree whole-heartedly to whatever we tabled there—which is most unlikely—the broad distrust of the Soviets in this country, carefully cultivated by the President, would test even the best selling skills of the Great Communicator to achieve ratification.

When we factor in such things as the Soviets’ unconscionable adventure in Afghanistan, and their perceived mischief in Central America, there is little basis for optimism.

“On the other hand there still remains the basic wisdom and common sense of the American people.”

On the other hand, there still remains the basic wisdom and common sense of the American people. While the peace movement may not be as visible or vocal as it was a year ago, there is strong sentiment in this country for a halt to the arms race. My wife, who travels the country regularly, insists that my colleagues and I seriously underestimate the depth of that feeling.

The Vietnam war, we must remind ourselves, was halted not by the politicians but by the people. And the people are capable of forcing a break in the gridlock mentality that currently paralyzes the Congress and the Presidency. They are not going to abide, ultimately, the mindless movement towards incineration of this planet. If the talks remain stalled, some President is going to be emboldened by the people to take that first step for peace—not one that jeopardizes our national security, to be sure, but one that draws out Soviet intentions and good faith. It will not take much for a beginning. From small acorns, giant oaks can grow.

Excerpts from the Floor Discussion:

CARL MARCY: Senator, you concluded your remarks by saying you hoped somebody would take a first step. I was waiting for the next sentence—what is the first U.S. step you would take or propose?

SENATOR BUMPERS: There are all kinds of things. . . . What if we said we are going to discontinue our flight testing of the MX missile for six months and ask the Soviet Union to respond in some kind of meaningful way. I don’t see how we can test their intentions any better than that. If the President really mistrusts them all that much, just think

of all the ammunition he would get if they didn’t respond. It seems to me it would be to his benefit to do something like that.

Several members suggested initiative-taking by the Congress.

SENATOR BUMPERS: You know, political courage in this country, in my opinion, is at an all time low. . . . As far as screwing up the will and the courage of Congress—we have to look to the people, it has to begin at home. That’s Betty Bumpers’ whole theme song about Peace Links. . . .

Floor Discussion (cont'd)

She is just trying to convince the people that it has to start with them, at the grass roots. . . . And to answer your question, that's the only way you'll ever stir up the courage of the United States Congress. *(The discussion continued after the speaker's departure.)*

ROBERT SCHMIDT: I think Senator Bumpers made a very cogent point this morning when he talked about the present administration and President Reagan's desire to reach an overwhelming military superiority. . . . I don't believe there is anybody . . . that believes that you can bring down the Soviet government, especially from the outside. If the Soviet government is up for reform, it will be done internally. We won't have much to do with that on the outside. . . . But there are people [in the Administration], and I think the majority of them believe in a military superiority which will make everybody drop their weapons without firing a shot.

KENNETH GALBRAITH: I would like to add a footnote on that . . . It is a peculiar mindless position. The problem that the Soviet economy faces is the standard that we and the Western Europeans set in the civilian economy,

in the extraordinary diversity of goods that come to be a part of the civilian economies of the Western industrial countries, including the United States, and the difficulty in the stolid planning system of capturing and replicating all of that extraordinary diverse structure of civilian goods. . . .

Their tragedy in some degree is that our civilian economy becomes their test of success. When one goes over to military production, in the Soviet Union or the US, one comes to what is intrinsically a planned structure. It is for us, it is for the Soviets. One lays out the production plans, the investment plans, the components, the interrelationships between industries, for months and years ahead. . . .

The extraordinary thing is that we, in this talk about running them [the Soviets] into the ground, are citing the thing in which they are most experienced and which is not our forte, is not our particular strength. . . . I would urge that this is something that we always have in mind and to which we react when we hear it.

DONALD KENDALL: . . . One of the greatest programs that I have seen anywhere to inform the public is out in the State of Washington where they started a program called "Target Seattle." They invited people from all persuasions on US-Soviet relations. They have the left, they



Left to right: Donald Kendall, Fred Warner Neal, Ambassador and Mrs. Dobrynin, Jeanne Vaughn Mattison, and Steven Cohen.

have the center, and they have the right. And these people opened up the schools, the churches and the auditoriums. For a solid week it was on television every day; it was in the newspapers. It is so successful that they are now taking it out across the state. The people in Seattle know these issues, and if we had a vote on foreign policy they would know which way they would want to vote.

HAROLD WILLENS: . . . In San Francisco, with the help of Mayor Feinstein, they allocated a certain amount of money from the budget to get this information widely distributed in a pamphlet, which brings the people of the city up to date on the realities of the issue and makes it comprehensible to them that the whole concept of civil defense is unrealistic. That if there is in fact a nuclear war or if nuclear weapons were ever released in California, it is a choice of being cooked alive on the outside or barbecued on the inside of one of these things (shelters). The pamphlet does it very effectively. Recently in Palo Alto there was a very exciting meeting in which the City Council first said to a group of citizens, "we cannot discuss this issue because it is a national issue and it is not something that we should have on our agenda." Somehow, accidentally, somebody was filming this meeting, and I saw the film just before I came here. In the course of the meeting the citizens said things which turned the Council around and they agreed first to allow the issue to be discussed and then secondly they voted in favor of a bilateral, verifiable, nuclear freeze.

STEPHEN COHEN: Some of us in this room are here because we are overwhelmed by the need for arms control. Some of us are here because we think that economic trade is a central issue. But what is really missing is attention to the basic fact that we should have learned from the 1970s, and that is that we will have none of these things, ever, in any durable way unless we have political accords with the Soviet Union. The word accord is in the name of the Committee. . . . The truth of the matter is that what used to be called "detente" died in Africa, East Europe, Afghanistan, Central America, and that we will never have arms control, or economic agreements, or cultural agreements, until there is a revitalization of American diplomacy toward the Soviet Union on these issues. Any arms control agreement, any economic agreement, any cultural agreement will die, it

will lack public support, it will lack political courage from above unless there is a set of political and diplomatic relationships with the Soviet Union that are durable.

And . . . given the distinguished members of this committee, and the credibility they have in the United States, it seems to me that we are the logical, and probably the only group, to try to draft some kind of political program about what we would want a new or an old administration in Washington to do. And that would include . . . the whole question of Israel, Afghanistan, Nicaragua, because those are the deathbeds of detente, of arms control, and yet those issues escape our attention. (Applause.)

JEANNE MATTISON: I'd like to respond. . . .


The committee has two major programs having to do with setting up a political agenda or at least exploring one and offering one. One is the General Nuclear Settlement which is a comprehensive look at nuclear arms control and it has seven major points which you will hear more of this afternoon from me and from Admiral Gayler. Secondly, the group of seven former U.S. Ambassadors to the Soviet Union, another one of our projects called Ambassadors Emeriti, are a resource for any administration to draw on. They take a view of relations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union that is long range, with no political short-term goals whatsoever. So we are headed in that direction. It is, in my view, the right thing to do. And I would love to have more ideas from board members and members on precisely that. Thank you.



Raymond Rubinow, on left, shakes hands with Edward Lamb as Harold Willens looks on.



Louisa Spencer with Robert Schmidt, President of the American Committee.



Left to right: Ambassador Dobrynin, Donald Kendall, J. Kenneth Galbraith.

A Diplomatic Tour D'Horizon

Informal Remarks by

*Ambassador of the USSR Anatoly Dobrynin
Annual Meeting of the American Committee on East-West Accord
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1984*

Ladies and gentlemen, my colleagues from the Diplomatic Corps, because I see here so many of them. I would like first of all to thank you for coming to this meeting to listen to the remarks which I am going to make. I see here so many familiar faces that it is another reminder that I have spent too much time in Washington. Well, these days so much is being said about the relationship of the United States with China. So I think it would be useful to hear at least a few words about the relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States.

I will put it this way. Our relations, to put it mildly, are not as great as they should be. Really, instead of East-West accord, we have a discord; and this is of course not a good idea for either my country or your country, East or West.

There are some views, in Washington and in some other places, that the Soviet government does not want to have any deals with the present Administration because of differences that we have, and specifically because of the election that is coming up in this country. This is not true, I can tell you authoritatively. We are quite prepared to deal with any administration, with this administration which was elected by your people, provided that there will be agreement on important questions with mutual benefits for both sides. If it is on the basis of equal security, we are quite prepared to come to any agreement, anytime—now, during the election, at the moment of the election, or after the election. I will give you some examples a little bit later of what exactly we have in mind.

Now as to official communication, I can report that it exists. There is a continuous exchange of letters between your President and my President. I have no difficulty at all meeting with the Secretary of State or his assistants, and the same is happening with your Ambassador Hartman in Moscow. He could meet with Mr. Gromyko or his assistants can have meetings any time they want. So, there is rather frequent exchange of views. From this point of view I should say that we really have communications. The trouble is, unfortunately, that there is no progress in substance due to these communications. And this is not a secret to you, and I just want to repeat what the situation is.

Of course the central issues in our relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States are questions of security, arms control, measures to prevent nuclear war. These are the central issues in our relationship and I think they are central for the whole international community. On these particular central issues we have not made any progress at all. You know where we stand. Both of our countries are unfortunately in dispute, deadlocked about European missiles and START negotiations.

Now there is a second rather dangerous trend developing, which is bringing the arms race into the cosmos. We still believe, strongly believe in the Soviet Union, that outer space should be kept out of the armament race. We strongly



believe this, because otherwise the relationship between our countries and the world will be seriously destabilized. We believe in the prohibition of antisatellite weapons. We hope that the government of the United States will consider carefully before making a final decision on this very crucial and important issue. It is important to us, it is important to you, and to all mankind.

During these last few months we have made several proposals that were not new but at the same time we consider them important. And they show that we don't care about whether there is an election or not an election. For instance, we proposed that the American side resume negotiations on a complete Test Ban Treaty which was interrupted as you know by the other side several years ago. This negotiation took place before. It was to be an agreement between the US and the Soviet Union. We still believe that it is a good thing to continue these discussions and to finish them, and we are quite prepared to do it now. It doesn't matter if it is before or after the election. Unfortunately this proposal received a negative answer. No negotiations.

"We are quite prepared to deal with any administration . . . whether there is an election or not an election."

There was of course the question about freezing. Again we made an official proposal to freeze or be prepared to discuss it at length and again unfortunately we received a negative answer. There are some other issues we should hope would be developed and discussed thoroughly. There is for example the Stockholm Conference, about measures of confidence. Let us hope there will be more fruitful discussions in Stockholm and not only between the two of us, because there are participating European countries.

So there is a certain kind of, we hope, movement, because this is a promising field, an important field, where until now, there was not much success but still, if both sides want it, there is a certain kind of compromise possible. On

the chemical weapons about which we are negotiating, for the time being it does not look very promising from our point of view, but of course we will be there to discuss it, and the Vienna talks on MBFR.

In between, we have had some discussion, though it was a sporadic discussion, between your government and my government on some local issues. I considered them useful although they didn't produce any specific results.

On bilateral things, there is some movement I should say. First if you take the "hot line", so called, between Moscow and the United States. It is of course not a political issue, it's a pure technical issue, since, as you know, there already exists a hot line between Moscow and Washington. As of now the governments when they communicate use a teletype. Now we can put on a new machine which will give you a copy. So you will have the whole text, or you may have a map, and so on. It is a definite improvement, though it doesn't have any specific application at this instance. I hope we will sign a protocol for this one because there do not seem to be any difficulties.

We are engaged in a discussion to fix the boundary line after, historically, we sold you Alaska, stupidly. (Laughter.) It was a line on the sea, but at that time you didn't care about oil and our Czar didn't care about much of anything. So the question is this line. We have had already two rounds on this one and I hope we will proceed in the near future

with another discussion, just to put this away.

In general it is a good sign that there are exchanges of delegations—not on an official level, but still it is important. Academician Velikhov and some scientists [from the Soviet Academy of Sciences] are now here for an Airlie House symposium, a meeting between academies of sciences—on an unofficial basis, but we favor this, it is a good idea.

"We believe in reason, in agreement, in finding the way out."

To return then to the larger picture, it is necessary for our governments to work together. We feel that—again, we don't believe in doomsday, we believe in reason, we believe in agreement, we believe in negotiations with your country and finding the way out. The history of our relationship, at least for the 23 years I have been here, shows that it is possible to solve our differences through negotiations; and really, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to hope very much that next time when I meet you, it doesn't matter what kind of administration you may have, I will be in a position to say something more positive than I did today. That is all. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

Some Questions from the Floor:

Unidentified Voice: Much of what I read in the Soviet press is rather harsh, and a great deal of what is said in the United States is very harsh. Well, if we have to get along together, as I am sure that we agree that we do, wouldn't it be easier if we change the tone?

AMBASSADOR DOBRYNIN: I agree with you, and I should say it should begin really from the top. (Laughter.) Otherwise there is no way. It should be government to government, leaders to leaders. Only in this way can you come to this [improved "tone" in relationship]. Because it doesn't matter—even with people of good will, government will still very much influence public opinion, both of them. . . . We should play down the rhetoric, and it must begin from the top and it will gradually come to the public.

STANLEY MARCUSS: Mr. Ambassador, a decade or so ago, many people in both the United States and the Soviet Union believed trade was an essential ingredient of the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union. What now?

AMBASSADOR DOBRYNIN: It is an [axiom] that the political environment . . . influences trade very much between these countries. Now there is practically no trade, it's true, because of the political climate. So, it is a matter of how you approach the problem. It is a two-way street problem. First way you may say look here, first we improve the political environment, then automatically we will have trade. It's true, this is one of the possible ways. The second way is, it doesn't matter what you have, but try to, little by little to improve trade through exchange with business people from both sides, more movement of goods and people and you will improve political relations. We are

prepared to do it both ways. If you mean by your question to have something to suggest from our side specifically, I could answer you this too with the general statement. We are prepared to deal with you both ways.

TEENA MAYERS: How would you view updating the Salt II by changing it from launchers to warheads? And leaving the basic treaty as is, when so much time and years have been spent on it with all the common understandings and the agreed statements and just updating that, changing the launchers to warheads. And reducing it, of course.



Teena Mayers gestures to Paul Warnke. In foreground, Louise Hoffman smiles at her husband Harrison, back to camera.

AMBASSADOR DOBRYNIN: Well, my dear lady, it is not that simple as you said, changing one thing for another. It may be said that it is, but it is not. I would put it this way. Salt II was signed by two Presidents of the United States. In Vienna there was a President, two Chiefs of Staff, from your country, General Jones, from ours General Ogarkov. There was a Minister of Defense from ours, Mr. Ustinov, from you it was the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Brown.

When you did this, there was an appendix where each single missile, each single plane, strategic plane, was counted then. Before they signed it, there were three or four months of various group discussions—not directly but through the State Department and the Foreign Ministry—counting each nuclear weapon that you and we have, and then top people from your country, from our


country signed it. This is the state of our relationship in the nuclear field. And we can see that it was more or less parity.

... But you have got to remember this particular treaty has a very important appendix. Which is not in force anymore. The appendix dealt with the cruise missiles. . . .

So this treaty is not the treaty that was really signed in '79, but a completely different treaty, which suits you more than us. Though we still continue to adhere to what is left and you continue to adhere to what is left. . . . Even now we are prepared to look not of course exactly as it is, but to negotiate and take it as a basis.

TEENA MAYERS: That is what I meant.

AMBASSADOR DOBRYNIN: And to look at this, but unfortunately, it doesn't go that way. This is the actual situation.



Ambassador Stoyan Zhulev of Bulgaria, on right, shares a point during the Annual Meeting.



Left to right: Raymond Garthoff, Alan Neidel, Spurgeon Keeney.

American Specialists on the Soviet Union

On April 27th a first, organizational meeting was held to establish the ground rules for the American Specialists' project. The objective of this enterprise, stated simply, is to share systematically with relevant policy makers the understanding of the Soviet system developed by independent academics, businessmen, and journalists.

The Specialists decided to seek a first meeting in September with the bipartisan leadership of Congress, followed in November by a meeting with the senior political advisers of the President-elect. What happens after that—over the planned three-year life of the project—will depend upon the success of these first sessions, the perspectives of the next Administration, and the availability of continued funding.

The Specialists propose to deal from their own

relative strength to the politicians' relative weakness. That is, they will not presume to advise their policy audiences whether to adopt a given trade or arms-control or exchanges policy. But they will be prepared to say whether such a policy is likely to topple the Soviet economy or induce a negotiating breakthrough or produce other specified effects. They will root their observations on these matters in experience, drawing on particular instances of the past to illumine the present and future.

Some participants have been chosen and others are still being identified. The criteria for membership are: a high degree of professionalism, independence of judgment, a balance of views, and the avoidance of polemics.

Moscow's Reevaluation of U.S.-Soviet Relations

by Fred Warner Neal



Fred Warner Neal, the Executive Vice President of the American Committee on East-West Accord, was in Moscow during and after the Andropov funeral.

Soviet views about the future of American-Soviet relations are undergoing a reevaluation that could have profound implications. Not only is there no optimism in Moscow regarding a possible improvement in the short-run, but also, more ominously, doubts—and worries—are being expressed about whether it is possible to have a “normal” relationship with the United States under any conditions.

This is something altogether new. In the past, no matter how bad American-Soviet relations were, the Soviet view was that an improvement was possible and, sooner or later, likely to come about. There were theoretical and pragmatic explanations for this view. It is no longer clear that it prevails.

The current reevaluation in the Kremlin stems not only from the harsh anti-Soviet position of the Reagan Administration but also from disillusionment with what is regarded in Moscow as nine years, more or less, of increasingly hostile American policies. Although Soviet officials regard the Democrats as possibly having a more pragmatic outlook, they see the beginnings of the current anti-Soviet trend as having taken place in the Carter as well as Ford Administrations. The entire history of U.S.-Soviet relations is under review. Even the long-run premises of detente—heretofore accepted uncritically—are now being questioned.

“There is no likelihood of a return to the nuclear arms negotiations [under present conditions.]”

In deciding what to do, and what not to do, vis-a-vis the United States, the Soviet leaders face a dilemma. They see

the Reagan Administration as trying to create the impression, for domestic political purposes, that possibilities for improved American-Soviet relations exist while in fact doing nothing to improve them. Given their view of the Administration, the Soviets wish to do nothing that might enhance Reagan's chances for reelection. But they realize there is a good chance he may be reelected anyway. If he is, in the Soviet view he could be likely to renew his harsh anti-Soviet stance; although, at the same time, this might conceivably be mitigated if certain American—Soviet collaborative efforts were to get underway before the election. The dilemma is, in one sense, less worrisome because of the conviction that no significant changes in the American posture will be forthcoming.

“The problem . . . is a perceived American refusal to accept the Soviet Union as a peer under any conditions.”

These conclusions emerged from or were reinforced by a series of recent conversations I had in the Kremlin, the Foreign Affairs ministry and elsewhere in Moscow. It was made clear to me that there is no likelihood of new Soviet foreign policy initiatives at this time, and even less possibility of a return to the nuclear arms negotiations as long as deployment of American intermediate range missiles in Western Europe continues. Likewise, there will almost certainly be no summit meeting, at least before the U.S. elections, even if President Reagan should propose one.

This is not to say that Soviet leaders would under no circumstances respond to new initiatives from Washington. But there is no anticipation in Moscow of any serious moves coming from the United States, and any American proposals are certain to be met with suspicion. The Soviet reaction to recent U.S. movements at the MBFR talks and to President Reagan's proposal for a ban on chemical weapons are examples.

In many ways, the key to understanding Moscow's pessimism is the Soviet insistence on equality. The prerequisite for a “normal” relationship with the United States, in Soviet considerations, is that the USSR must be accepted as an equal superpower. The problem, as seen from the Kremlin, is not so much that there may be differences about what constitutes equality as it is a perceived American refusal to accept the Soviet Union as a peer under any conditions.

In this context, American military developments the Russians see as giving us a first-strike nuclear capacity—the MX, the Trident II and the Euro-missiles—become additionally threatening and increase support for further expansion of Soviet arsenals.

“We don't know what to do except to match the Americans' new weapons systems,” a Party military expert stated.

"Even our military men understand that an expanding arms race increases risks of thermonuclear war. It is true that factors of prestige enter in. But even so we all believe that for us not to counter the American military expansion would be even more dangerous."

These negative Soviet reactions were already well-formed before Yuri Andropov died and have nothing to do with the advent of Konstantin Chernenko as General Secretary of the Communist Party. No one in Moscow seems to think that Chernenko's election will produce anything new.

"There may be some differences in the Politburo on domestic policy," one is advised, "but there have been no signs of any substantive disagreement on foreign policy." It is especially unlikely, members of the Central Committee say, that Chernenko will advance any significant new departures, if only because he is regarded as a somewhat pedestrian Party apparatchik who throughout his career has concentrated on domestic policy matters.

Inertial Forces

Kremlinology is in many ways like astrology. It is lots of fun but doesn't have much substance. The goings-on within the Kremlin are so arcane and so closely guarded that even highly placed Soviet officials outside the Politburo itself can only guess. The "inside Kremlinology" above, while probably correct, actually is therefore not necessarily more reliable than the "outside" variety. The fact is that nobody in Moscow, including those who have dealt with him, seems to have a very clear picture of what Chernenko may try to do. As one of his Central Committee associates remarked, "We don't expect anything new, but you never really know how being Number One is going to affect a man."

Some of the Soviet points of view I have reported here are understandable, other less so. The point is not whether they are justified but that they exist. This is the reality with which we now have to deal as far as the USSR is concerned.

Ambassadors Emeriti

On April 17 the American Committee arranged a video history taping session, funded by the Sloan Foundation, with the former U.S. Ambassadors to the Soviet Union. A written transcript was also prepared.

From this rich mine of recollected experience, along with the records of prior meetings among the Ambassadors, there may emerge some kind of collegial consensus on the effective conduct of relations with the Soviet Union.

Present plans are to review this possibility with the Ambassadors at their next meeting in September, and then to seek their judgment on appropriate next steps.

Carl Marcy, the former co-director of the American Committee and for many years the staff director of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is directing this work.

Please feel free to use or reproduce these materials, crediting *East-West Outlook*, a publication of the American Committee on East-West Accord.

American Committee on East-West Accord

109 Eleventh Street S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20003
(202) 546-1700

Nonprofit Org.
US POSTAGE
PAID
Permit No. 442
Washington, DC

**ANNUAL
MEETING
June-July 1984**

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED