

Editorial

Nunn's offer of surrender

The Congress is presently conducting a new round of budgetary debate, in which the true issue debated is whether or not the United States accepts the status of a tolerated, semi-independent satrapy in a global Soviet empire. If the military doctrines which have been put forth by Senator, and Democratic presidential aspirant Sam Nunn were adopted in even a limited degree, the new military budget would be, in effect, Congress's decision to surrender West Germany to Moscow.

Of course, Nunn has not stated openly that he proposes that the U.S. surrender to Moscow. What he has done, has been to propose a military budgetary doctrine which is represented as bringing U.S. military commitments back to within the limits of what the Congress is willing to spend commitments back to within the limits of what the Congress is willing to spend for U.S. forces. This involves pulling approximately 100,000 U.S. military personnel out of West Germany, and one brigade out of Korea. If the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Germany begins, the immediate consequence will be actions leading toward West Germany's withdrawal from the NATO military alliance. That would mean that all of Western Europe becomes indefensible, and that the U.S. withdraws very soon to an indefensible region within North America itself. At that latter point, Moscow rules the world for perhaps a century or two yet to come—if our species survives that long under Soviet-dictated economic conditions.

The argument by Nunn and his co-thinkers is, that U.S. strategic commitments presently exceed the existing and projectable levels of U.S. forces' capabilities, and that, therefore, our global commitments must be reduced and rearranged to fit those levels of capabilities allowed by implementation of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislation.

This argument is accompanied by the devout wish, that the Soviets will respect the limits of warfare set by the new budget proposed by Gramm-Rudman advocates, and not present us with a threat beyond our sharply curtailed levels of strategic commitments. This wish-

ful assumption is backed by the variously lying or merely lunatic reassurances of fellows such as Kissinger, Brzezinski, and Haig, that internal problems of the Soviet empire will happily limit the level of threat to the level of our reduced strategic commitments.

Much more important than Nunn's proposals as such, is the fact that the ruining of our military capabilities is chiefly the result of President Reagan's refusal, so far, to face the reality, that the "Reagan economic recovery" has been an accelerating slide into what are presently depression-level conditions in most parts of the United States.

Federal budgetary priorities must be based upon recognition of potentially fatal threats to the existence of our nation, or of large portions of our population. The budgetary crisis is not sufficient reason to judge adequate military capabilities as "cost-prohibitive." However, adequate defense means not less than a \$50-\$75 billion annual increase in after-inflation-adjustment military expenditures, and probably \$100-\$150 billion if all factors are considered.

The solution ought to be obvious: The United States needs a genuine economic recovery most urgently. The problem has been, that with "Rasputin" Donald Regan as Treasury Secretary and White House Chief of Staff, the President is stubbornly committed to the proposition that a grand economic recovery is already in progress. The President has been insisting, since about April 1983, that his administration's policies, which have actually guided us into the worst economic-depression conditions since the 1930s, must not be changed. So far, the President has preferred to curtail national defense, however reluctantly, rather than admit the simple fact that his "economic agenda" has been the most miserable failure since Herbert Hoover's.

So, as long as Donald Regan remains in the White House, the United States continues to become increasingly indefensible. No economic recovery is possible, until this aspect of the situation in the White House is changed.