cept to deter one’s opponent from using them.”

As to NATO’s “opponent,” its attachment to nuclear weapons is rather easily understood when one analyzes its geographic situation and economy. Without such weapons, despite the large conventional forces available through the Warsaw Pact, the Soviets’ writ, in my view, would not run very far. In fact, nuclear weapons production and development is the only modern sector of the Soviet economy; and to the Soviet Union’s way of thinking, the gains it stands to make over the long run through its nuclear threat probably outrun the dangers of the ongoing weapons buildup.

There is, of course, another sort of deterrence that nuclear weapons have effected. Because every conflict has the potential for escalating into a superpower nuclear engagement, nuclear nations are loath to enter the fray, and currently about twenty conventional wars proceed unchecked. This was the situation in which President Carter found himself vis-à-vis the Iranian hostages, as the late Hans Morgenthau explained in Worldview in June, 1980:

The anarchic character of the international system forces Carter, following historical convention, to contemplate physical violence, even nuclear war, as the ultimate factor in the settlement of international issues. Yet the irrationality of such violence makes him shrink from the use even of conventional violence lest it might escalate into nuclear war. Thus in an international crisis the president acts with utmost caution—if he acts at all—and he compensates for the lack of provocative action with bellicose talk.

We have at the moment a situation not unlike the one facing Carter: how to respond to the USSR’s tension-building probes in Central America and the Middle East, and to the stalled arms talks. Certainly, unilateral disarmament would produce substantial change in the superpower relationship, but if growing numbers of Europeans seem willing to pay a possibly steep price for the lifting of the nuclear threat, it is not one most Americans are willing to bear.

Robert J. Myers is President of CRIA.

EXCURSUS 2

Tinley Nyandak on TERROR IN TIBET

Recent events in Tibet have once again propelled that troubled Asian land into the Western press. Since 1950, when China first invaded Tibet, the Chinese presence has been the source of outrage and tragedy. By 1959 the Chinese had assumed complete control of Lhasa, the capital, leading to the dramatic flight of His Holiness the Dalai Lama, Tibet’s spiritual and temporal leader, and the mass exodus of thousands of Tibetans into India, Nepal, and Bhutan.

Since 1959 an estimated one million Tibetans have died as the result of Chinese occupation, and more than three thousand temples and monasteries have been razed. In late August of this year the level of oppression in Tibet rose sharply and suddenly. Perhaps not irrelevant is the fact that earlier that month some forty foreign journalists visited Tibet, and shortly thereafter their articles appeared in the international media. Most of the articles focused on Tibetan dissatisfaction with Chinese rule and included conversations with Tibetan dissidents, who expressed their desire for independence under the leadership of the Dalai Lama.

Jeff Sommer of Newsday wrote in his August 15 article that “in the streets, in their homes, in monastery corridors and deserted parks and alleyways, Tibetans said their dream is to see their spiritual leader, the Dalai Lama, come back from his exile in India. Most said they hoped the Dalai Lama would somehow come up with a way of ousting Chinese officials.”

Similarly, Michael Weisskopf noted in the Washington Post of August 13: “When foreign correspondents arrived last week, dissidents were armed only with literature. They roamed the bazaar at night, quickly slipping notes to the visitors and dashing off. Several letters written in Tibetan were addressed to the United Nations from ‘the people of Tibet.’”

Weisskopf added that one letter, partly written in English, urged Beijing to “stop genocide, stop butchery” in Tibet, and called for independence. Dissidents also told Weisskopf that Chinese opposition again had been forced underground because of an intensified public security dragnet that had jailed thousands of activists and executed many leaders. According to these dissenters, the Chinese still held 2,500 political prisoners in Tibet.

The August clampdown involved mass arrests, including five Tibetan deputies (elected officials of Tibetans in exile) who were visiting relatives, searches of private dwellings, and a curfew in Lhasa and other major cities. The Chinese declared the arrests were a move to round up black marketers and Tibetans without residential permits and ration cards. They have admitted, however, that those arrested include political activists.

But the events in Tibet did not gain wide publicity in the West until United Press International and the New York Times reported in October that nine Tibetans had been executed—and that more executions were expected. A Nepalese diplomat stationed in Lhasa confirmed that on October 1 five Tibetans were executed after they and twenty-six fellow prisoners were paraded through the streets in an open truck—a spectacle staged as a warning to others.

On September 30 the Dalai Lama issued a statement from New Delhi asking the U.N., Amnesty International, and the International Commission of Jurists to stop the executions. “The standard method,” commented the Dalai Lama, “is a bullet in the back of the head. The executions may also be in public, in which case all members of the victim’s family will be forced to attend the execution dressed in their best and applaud and thank the Chinese authorities for eliminating anti-social and reactionary elements.”

In Tibet, the Chinese claim that these mass arrests and executions are part of their current nation-wide campaign against crime. The Associated Press reported on October 17 that 700,000 had been arrested in China since August, and they quote one Chinese source as saying “Some have been executed, while others have been exiled or sent to labor reform camps for re-education.” Recent Tibetan visitors to Tibet bring word of a Chinese announcement that a second round of mass arrests will be conducted in Tibet in October and a third will begin in January.

From 1962 to 1976 there were nine resistance movements and forty-four uprisings in Tibet, all crushed by an occupation army of more than 320,000 troops. In the last three years there has been some relaxation in relations, but recent events suggest that once again terror and brute force are to reign in Tibet.

Tinley Nyandak is editor of News-Tibet, a magazine published by the Office of Tibet (New York), which represents the Dalai Lama.