A New Yorker staff reporter, author of several books dealing with the atomic age, recently "put in a fair amount of time in Washington" addressing to members of the United States government—including the secretaries of Defense and State, the Chairman of the AEC, the Budget Director, "senators, congressmen, multi-starred generals, and decision-making scientists"—the question: "just how much is enough when it comes to nuclear weapons?" Daniel Lang's "Inquiry into Enoughness," which appears in the November issue of October 10, chronicles his discussions in the Pentagon and State Department and on Capitol Hill, and ends with the report of a visit to an ICBM silo.

He remarks about these talks that "the need for wisdom, it was pointed out to me in the course of my inquiry, is compounded by the curious possibility that the United States and the Soviet Union may be in arms races with themselves as well as with each other. This possibility, which adds immeasurably to the elusiveness of the question of enough, derives from the fact that the arms race is by no means the symmetrical affair that it is commonly supposed to be. We and the Russians, it appears, do not match new weapon for new weapon, production schedule for production schedule. . . . Moreover, according to Defense Department people who have dealt with the Russians, their nation and ours don't even go about assessing the respective threats to themselves in the same way. 'We don't believe a nuclear war would last long, but they seem to think in terms of campaigning through one,' I was told by one of Secretary McNamara's chief assistants. . . ."

Lang notes that "the upshot of this asymmetry . . . is that to a considerable extent there may now be in progress two unilateral races that bear little relation to each other or to the main one that we are constantly hearing about. These races, clearly, would not be going on if each side knew what the other was up to, but until such a day dawns, the Pentagon and its Soviet counterpart will be understandably preoccupied with perfecting what they do know about for certain: their own military establishments."

In a review of several American books which have just been published in British editions—one each by Robert Osgood, Herman Finer, Richard Stebbins, Robert R. Bowie, and two by Barry Goldwater—the London Times Literary Supplement comments about what it calls the "anthropomorphic fallacy" of international relations. This fallacy, the issue of October 29 states, "consists in failing to recognize two fundamental differences between the society of nations and the society of human beings within a sovereign state, as we know them at the present stage of the world's history." For, "in the first place, there is no sovereignty governing international relations, as there is governing those between individuals; and from this flows the second difference, that between nations the concepts of justice and peace are not, as they are between individuals in a civilized society, co-extensive and inseparable."

However, continues the article, "there is one important respect in which the anthropomorphic view of international relations is not wholly fallacious. Nations are composed of human beings, and human beings are subject to conflicting motivations. Man is not only a political animal; he is also a pragmatic, an ethical and an emotional animal. Different instincts often drag him in different directions on the same subject; and this is just as true of his attitude towards international as towards internal questions, particularly in the case of the Anglo-Saxon peoples."

"A typical example of the conflict of instincts in our relations within our own national society is to be seen over the problem of capital punishment; a typical example in the international context is the problem of nuclear weapons. The nature of the two problems is curiously similar, because both involve the concept of deterrence. The nature of the conflicting instincts is also similar, and lucky are those few who are in each case impelled in the same direction by all their instincts. For most people there is no such luck. It is the hard fate of the American people to have reached their pre-eminent position in a world in which—unlike the world of the Pax Britannica—almost every major problem in international relations involves some such conflict between equally strong and equally commendable instincts."

The dilemma which this raises, continues the review, "is becoming even more painful because of the state of transition in which we live. It is no longer possible even in theory, as it was a generation ago, for the would-be realist to identify and define precisely the national self-interest which he proposes to put first. The nation-state, even the largest of its kind, has ceased to be a self-sufficient unit of sovereignty, but it is still uncertain what kind of system will take its place."

A September 12 editorial in the Saturday Review calls attention to a report by John H. E. Fried, "The Impact of the U.N. on the Finances of the USA," which, in the words of general editor Hallowell Bowser, "has shown that the U.N. has a most significant and salubrious effect on the economic life.
of New York City and the country generally."

The Professor's report, portions of which can be found in the recent study Financing the United Nations, "explode[s] the tenaciously held notion that the United Nations takes more out of the American Economy than it puts in," Bowser states. He relates Fried's findings about the impact of the world organization's spending in New York (for supplies, services, wages, etc.), on the U.S. economy in general (for goods and equipment purchased by such agencies as UNICEF and the shipping of these materials in American vessels), and in the area of investment (the U.N. Joint Staff Pension Fund, for example, has been invested in "over $100 million in U.S. Government Bonds, the bonds and common stocks of U.S. Corporations, and the bonds of U.S. public agencies").

"Clearly," says the editorial, "the professor's revelations will take quite some getting used to, especially among those who have scorned the U.N. as a poor relation, a kind of remittance man within the family of nations. It will, in fact be ironic if these and other detractors of the parliament-of-man idea suddenly find themselves supporting the U.N. not because they admire its moral and political achievement, but simply because they have discovered that the damned thing brings in a buck."

Under what circumstances can a rabbi speak from the pulpit on political matters? Are there guidelines or limits that must be observed? In a brief article published in the Reconstructionist (October 2), Henry Cohen of Beth David Reform Congregation in Philadelphia discusses the dilemma of the Jewish religious leader who wishes to comment upon the partisan issues of his time.

It is "a basic principle of Judaism that religion should be concerned with all of life," writes Rabbi Cohen, and certainly political issues fall within the area of legitimate concern. "Prophetic Judaism especially should speak out on matters affecting the freedom of man and the peace of the world." Surely "if Judaism does not attempt to relate its ideas to the problems of living, then our faith becomes socially irrelevant."

Cohen recognizes, however, that "the spokesman for Judaism—the rabbi—faces obvious problems in his effort to be specific. By what authority," he asks, "is he entitled to state how freedom and peace are to be achieved? Is the rabbi to pose as Eric Severaid with a tallit [prayer shawl]?"

"The answer," Rabbi Cohen states, "is three-fold: 1) The rabbi's interpretation of the facts of political and social life must be subjected to the same searching criticism that other interpretations receive. He has not, nor does he pretend to have, any direct line to God. The rabbi is simply doing what any Jew concerned with Judaism and the world should be doing. 2) As a teacher of Judaism the rabbi's special function is to stimulate the conscience of man to overcome indifference, and to help men judge justly when their own demands conflict with the demands of their neighbors. The rabbi must try to discover the best solutions to these problems, for the well-being of the human community."

And third, Cohen states, "the rabbi should speak within the context of Judaism. The inspiration and insights of our heritage give a particular perspective to questions of freedom and peace. However," he cautions, "as he tries to stimulate conscience and to weigh conflicts of interests in the light of Jewish morality, he must not be dogmatic, for there are so many complexities in our world that none of us can pretend to 'play God'.''

The War Control Planners, Inc. (Box 35, Chappaqua, New York) has announced the reprinting of a large number of copies of its book called War Safety Control Report, at the request of the Committee on Discussion and Debate of the National University Extension Division. The book, available at three dollars a copy, will be of use to the high school and college debating teams who are discussing this year: "What policy for control of weapons systems would best insure the prospects for world peace?"

The War Control Planners is "a non-political, non- profit educational organization...to provide an instrument through which individual citizens may contribute their professional talents, their communications capabilities, or their financial support to aid in the debate and clarification of the strategic goal of a proper moral war-proof world, and to educate the public regarding the emerging war control powers becoming available for the first time in history" (Newsletter, September 1964).

The debate over the American proposal for a mixed-manned nuclear fleet continues both in the U.S. and abroad. War/Peace Report for October published the Navy's response to an invitation to contribute "The Case for the Nuclear Fleet." The magazine had previously printed, in the August issue, three articles critical of the MF, and a critical editorial appears in the October issue.

From England comes another view of the multilateral solution to the problem of weapons sharing. Alastair Buchan, Director of the Institute for Strategic Studies in London, looks at the proposals in "historical retrospect." His article, in the October issue of the British quarterly review International Affairs, is titled "The Multilateral Force: A Study in Alliance Politics."