

SOME UNFINISHED BUSINESS, THE NONPROLIFERATION TREATY

VOLUME 11, NO. 10 OCTOBER 1968

Published monthly (except for a combined August issue) by the Center for International Affairs, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138. Subscription price \$7.00 per year in advance for individuals.

Address: 730 Massachusetts Street, New York, New York 10017, U.S.A.

EDITORIAL BOARD

James R. Schlesinger
John E. Lehman
A. J. Auer

Editorial Assistant: Susan Woolfeon

CONTENTS

In the Magazine	2
Some Unfinished Business, The Nonproliferation Treaty	3
What's Behind the Soviet Policy	4
Regional Security Challenges to the U.S.	5
A Treaty of Non-Alignment	10
U.S. Policy on Nuclear Proliferation	13
More on the Nonproliferation Treaty	17
In the News	19

"The conclusion of the [Nonproliferation] Treaty encourages the hope that other steps may be taken toward a peaceful world. And it is for those reasons and in this perspective that I have described this treaty as the most important international agreement since the beginning of the nuclear age."

This was President Johnson's considered opinion as the Treaty was signed on July 1 of this year by the ambassadors of over fifty nations. The world has lived with nuclear weapons for over twenty years and — contrary to the dire predictions of early prophets — we have survived very bad times, severe international conflicts and bloody wars without recourse to these weapons. Those who refused to panic at the fact of their existence, who refused to accept the assertion that their employment was inevitable, who rejected the time clock projected by many informed and respected scientists and political theorists — these people have had their judgment at least partially confirmed by the years since 1945.

Nevertheless, we did have a nuclear confrontation between the two superpowers in 1962, and the United States has seen George Wallace choose as his running mate for the highest offices in the land a General who regards nuclear weapons as simply more powerful conventional weapons. Even those who regard the present deterrent system as the best alternative the nation-states can presently achieve do not believe that it has brought about the best of all possible worlds. The balance of terror has achieved a less precarious balance than its detractors have suggested, but in the meantime the weapons of terror have not been reduced but increased. The citizens of the two most powerful nations in the world, the U.S. and USSR, hold in hostage each others' citizens. While hysteria is not helpful in this situation neither is moral and political blindness. The situation is unpleasant and unproductive. And it is not beyond rational improvement.

It is in this context that one must view the Nonproliferation Treaty which still awaits official U.S. ratification. Like the Test-Ban Treaty of 1963, an achievement of the Kennedy Administration, it was achieved only after intense debate and strong disagreement among government advisors. For the advisors who were consulted differed in their judgments about the short- and long-term consequences of the Treaty. While many of the arguments against the Treaty are sound and not lightly to be dismissed, present benefit and the long-term advantages implied in President Johnson's statement are of greater weight. The Treaty could represent a small but important step towards the goal of modifying the balance of

terror (our present deterrent system), a step toward at least partial international control over nuclear weapons. Formal U.S. ratification of the Treaty must apparently wait for a new administration, but it should then be given high priority.

J.F.

WORLD POVERTY AND THE WORLD BANK

Discussion and debate about the obligations rich nations have toward poor nations is going to be with us for some time. And the most serious aspect of that discussion will turn not on the question of whether rich nations *have* that obligation but whether they can adequately discharge it. Major religious organizations and spokesmen have thrown their full weight behind general proposals to aid the poor countries, to narrow the economic gap between rich and poor countries. The general intent of these proposals has been supported by many who are professionally equipped to deal with technical aspects of the severe problems that are involved in such an attempt.

In the meantime, the gap continues to grow. As the President pointed out not long ago, the United States has 6% of the world's population and 50% of its wealth. And while its economic growth continues, Americans are apparently limiting the size of their families. In many other parts of the world, however, population growth equals or exceeds economic growth. In addition to these conditions, with which we have been familiar for some time, there are, we are now being told, other problems we had not foreseen.

The greatest obstacle to our best intentions, this argument runs, is that we simply don't know how to cope with the problem. We don't know how to pump capital into countries that are so poorly developed they cannot accept it without grave political, economic and cultural disruption. We don't know how to help the peoples of many countries to limit the growth of their population without seeming to impose upon them our own cultural standards. We don't know how to persuade seemingly obtuse and recalcitrant leaders that they must change their ways or preside over chaos, at their own expense and that of their people. We don't know how to offer aid to weaker countries without entangling ourselves in re-

straints and obligations that lead to increasing U.S. involvement and control. We don't know . . . and the list goes on.

But some agencies and individuals while recognizing the complexity and dangers of the situation have decided to push ahead. One of these agencies is the World Bank which is being guided by its strong new president, Robert S. McNamara, into new and untried paths. If he achieves his present goals the World Bank will, within five years, have increased loans to poorer countries by several hundred per cent. And the World Bank, again under his guidance, is willing to offer substantial loans to member-countries that wish to institute or develop methods to limit population growth. Most loans are intended to aid agricultural growth, education, medical attention, thereby combatting poverty and its worst consequences.

The significance of these efforts lies not only in what, hopefully, they will accomplish, but in what they will spur others to do. The others in this case include the Congress of the United States, the large corporations, the very rich, the average citizen.

A NEW FEATURE

With this issue of *worldview*, we introduce as a regular feature of the journal columns by *John R. Inman* and *Bernard Murchland*.

Mr. Inman, vice president of the Council on Religion and International Affairs, will comment on the U.N. and on the multitudinous issues related to its existence, its travails and its goals. Mr. Inman is eminently qualified to analyze and judge these issues for, in his role as CRIA representative at the U.N., he has for many years observed it from within.

Mr. Murchland, a member of the faculty of Ohio Wesleyan University, will report regularly on those aspects of international affairs which most deeply engage the attention of those in academic life, faculty and students. This will involve, it has become clear to all of us, some continuing discussion of the function of the university in our national life.

These two columnists will, in coming months, be joined by others who will be introduced to our readers as their first columns appear in *worldview*.

The Editor.