Missile Debate Turns Into a Battle of the Charts

David Packard, Deputy Secretary of Defense, defends the Administration on antimissile system. Senator J. W. Fulbright, chairman of Foreign Relations Committee, in foreground.

PACKARD DISPUTED
AT MISSILE INQUIRY

Foes of Defense Plan Say
U.S. ‘Overkill’ Capability Blunts Soviet Threat

By JOHN W. FINNEY
Special to The New York Times
WASHINGTON, March 26—The opposition to the Administration’s antimissile defense took a new tack today by seeking to demonstrate that the United States had so strong an “overkill” capability that it need not fear the build-up in Soviet missile strength.

The debate on the antimissile system turned into an unusual battle of charts before the Senate Foreign Relations Disarmament Subcommittee.

Deputy Defense Secretary David Packard, who was kept waiting in the wings last week by the subcommittee, was finally given an opportunity to present the Pentagon’s carefully drawn charts. They showed that the Soviet Union was reaching parity with the United States in land-based and submarine-based missiles.

Commitment From Packard

From this development, Mr. Packard once again drew the Administration’s conclusion that the Soviet Union was seeking to achieve a “first strike” capability and that the United States therefore, must protect its Minuteman missile force with the Safeguard system.

The subcommittee also obtained a commitment from Mr. Packard that the Administration would not proceed with the Safeguard system, using left over funds, until it had been authorized by Congress. Because authorization bills will not come before Congress until late spring, this gives the opposition about two months to build an intensive “educational” case against the Safeguard system.

There was a new feeling of optimism among the opposition Senators that by this spring
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they could round up enough
support to block the Safeguard
system.
Mr. Packard had not sooner
finished his "chart talk" than
Senator Albert Gore, Democrat
of Tennessee, the subcommittee
chairman, asked him "to lend
me your wand" and unveiled
charts that he and his staff had
sat up until midnight preparing.
The Gore charts were de-
signed to demonstrate that, in
terms of deliverable nuclear
warheads, the United States
would retain so strong an
"overkill" capacity that it need
not fear the Soviet Union would
acquire a "first strike" capa-
bility.
"First strike" capability is the
ability to launch so devastat-
ing an attack on an adversary's
missile and bomber forces that
the adversary cannot retaliate.
"Overkill" is the capacity to
launch an attack far stronger
than is necessary to achieve
the objective.
In his first solo appearance
before a Congressional com-
munity, Mr. Packard, a former
West Coast electronics manu-
facturer, may have stubbed his
toe to the potential embarrass-
ment of the Administration In
the missile debate.
Talk Called "Casual"
Pressed by Senator J. W. Ful-
bright, Democrat of Arkansas
as to whether non-Pentagon sci-
centists had been consulted in
the Administration's review of
the antimissile system, Mr.
Packard finally mentioned
Wolfgang Panofsky of Stanford
University. A leading authority
on radar, Dr. Panofsky helped
develop the Klystron tube, a
key component in the high-
powered radar that will be used
in the Safeguard system.
Dr. Panofsky, who entered
the hearing room after the ses-
sion was closing, told reporters
that he had had only a "casu-
al" conversation with Mr.
Packard. Furthermore, he said,
"I have some very serious
engineer criticism of the
[Safeguard] system."
Dr. Panofsky was so agitated
over the Packard statement
that he asked permission to
testify to "straighten out the
record." Senator Gore then
announced that the scientist
will be the lend-off witness at
a hearing Friday.
Criticism Is Reported
With Dr. Panofsky, tiesub-
committee may have gained a
foothold in the inner councils
of the Administration and may
be able to demonstrate that
there was dissenion among
President Nixon's science ad-
visers over proceeding with
the Safeguard system.
Dr. Panofsky reportedly
served on the panel of the
President's Science Advisory
Committee that reviewed the
proposed Safeguard system.
Congressional sources say that
the panel submitted a critical
report questioning the engi-
neering design and feasibility
of the $6.6-billion system.
Senator Gore said that, on the
basis of Defense Department
figures and projections, the
United States now has a"la-
ter larger overkill capacity" than
the Soviet Union and will have
it into the next decade.
As of today, he noted, the
United States has 2,400 stra-
tic warheads and the Soviet
Union about 1,100. By 1975,
when both sides have de-
veloped multiple warheads for
their missiles, he estimated the
United States would have about
8,000 and the Soviet Union
5,000.
To destroy 50 large cities, he
postulated, would require about
250 warheads pointing his
"wand" toward the graph
showing the growth in war-
heads over the next six years,
he said:
"This is all overkill. And yet
we want to build another
weapons system. This is mad-
ness. If we keep on going this
way, we will blow the whole
world up."
Senator Gore's argument was
that, with such an American
"overkill" capability, the Soviet
Union could not hope to ac-
quire a "first strike" capability.
Senator Gore's argument was
never directly answered by Mr.
Packard, who reiterated his
lead in warheads, 400 of
which are said to equal
"unacceptable" damage.
argument that the United States was only trying to protect its retaliatory capability.

Opponents of the Safeguard system also began developing another argument—that the best way to protect the Minuteman force and deter the Russians would be to make clear that the Minuteman missiles would be fired before attacking Soviet warheads could reach their target.

Mr. Packard implied that such "automatic" quick retaliation would drive the United States toward "a form of doomsday machine." Before ordering retaliation, he said, the President might want to think the facts rather than shoot from the hip.

Clarification on Safeguard

Mr. Packard stated that the Soviet Union had not yet deployed any missile-carrying atomic warheads against the United States. The United States, contrary to the impression left by defense officials in testimony last week, had little doubt that the SS-9 intercontinental missile would become a "first-strike" weapon only when equipped with multiple warheads. Equipped with its estimated 24-28 atomic warheads, therefore, the missile would not have such capability.

The estimate that the SS-9 has a SS-9-178A warhead was not based on any "hard" intelligence information but rather on a presumption based on the possession of such warhead.

\[\text{AP March 20, 1969} \text{AP} - \text{Reports that the \textit{Nixon Administration plans to use the Safeguard system as a "trump card" in negotiations with the Soviet Union are "quite alarming," a Communist party newspaper said today.} \text{\textit{Sovetskaya Rosiya,} published by the party central committee, warned that "such tactics will lead to no good for Washington politicians."} \]
Nixon's Foreign Aid Advisers Pressing Him to Set Amount

By FELIX BELAIR Jr.

WASHINGTON, March 26—An interagency panel has urged President Nixon to decide soon whether the United States is a member, is to limit its foreign aid to a token or holding operation.

The United States economic aid in all forms has been running at about 0.5 per cent of national income in recent years. This country has dropped to seventh place on the list, of donor countries, based on total official aid as a percentage of national income.

The objective of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, of which the United States is a member, is 1 per cent of national income, a level this country has not reached since 1965.

The report, now under study by the National Security Council, projects separate minimal levels of economic foreign aid in the fiscal year beginning July 1.

The first option suggests an aid authorization of $1.3-billion, or about the amount Congress appropriated for the current year. The second calls for
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$2.1-billion. That amount is nearly $250-million less than that requested by President Johnson in his Budget Message to Congress last January.

Both approaches contemplate an additional authorization for military assistance ranging from $350-million to $375-million in the new year, apart from any appropriation for military credit sales.

The estimate for military grants also excludes amounts earmarked in the defense budget as military aid to Vietnam, Laos and Thailand, and infrastructure costs of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Known as National Security Memo 4, the report was compiled by representatives of the Departments of State, Defense and Treasury, the Export-Import Bank, the Council of Economic Advisers and the Agency for International Development.

It was filed with the Security Council last week.

Even if the President adopted the higher of the two economic aid packages— and asked Congress to appropriate that amount for the new fiscal period, it would be the lowest such request in this country's history of foreign aid.

If he elects to propose the lower figure, however, the report makes it clear that the foreign aid program could no longer be considered an instrument of United States foreign policy.

Because the $1.3-billion would be concentrated in eight or nine countries would have a staggering impact on the Alliance for Progress.

This course would also mean the virtual termination of development loans and grants to India and Pakistan and termination of all but food aid to Afghanistan.

The Alliance for Progress which now embraces 18 Latin-American states, would have to be limited, in this view, to Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Bolivia and possibly to Peru. If aid is not terminated to that country as a result of its export of United States petroleum properties.
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U.S.-Spanish Pact
On Military Bases
Extended 5 Years

BY BENJAMIN WELLES
Special to The New York Times
WASHINGTON, March 30—
The United States and Spain announced agreement in principle today to extend for five more years the United States' military base rights in Spain.

Robert J. McCloskey, the State Department spokesman, made the announcement this evening. He said that Secretary of State William P. Rogers and the Spanish Foreign Minister, Fernando Maria Castiella y Maiz, had "reached agreement in principle on the nature of the arrangements for the new five-year period of the defense agreement, which both Governments agree should take place subject to the completion of the negotiations of the written documents that will express such arrangements."

The agreement was reached yesterday in private talks between Secretary of State William P. Rogers and Fernando Maria Castiella y Maiz, the Spanish Foreign Minister, according to the informants.

The military, economic and political assistance that the United States will ultimately furnish Spain in return for the U.S. military facilities will be the subject of protracted bargaining in the coming months.

Foreign Minister Castiella, who flew here over the week-end, proposed the extension of the negotiations yesterday. It was said, and his offer was immediately agreed to by Mr. Rogers.

Mr. Castiella stressed that Spain wishes to continue close defense cooperation with the United States.

Today Mr. Castiella spent nearly an hour with President Nixon and several of his advisers. The Spanish, who is of Basque origin and who likes to recall that he had a grandmother born in Texas, took pains to deny reports that Spain was turning isolationist.

Following the meeting, other sources said that Mr. Nixon had selected Robert C. Hill, a former ambassador, to Mexico, Costa Rica, and Salvador, as ambassador to Madrid. Mr. Hill, a former executive of W. R. Grace & Co., served as an assistant secretary of state for congressional relations during the Eisenhower Administration. He will succeed Robert E. Mosbey, former mayor of New York, who recently resigned.

BASIS OF PACT SET
BY U.S. AND SPAIN
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In an interview in the Span-
By JOSEPH LELYVELD
Special to The New York Times

KARACHI, Pakistan, March 26—The new military regime in Pakistan promised today to make way for a constitutional government chosen on the basis of universal suffrage. But it set no deadline for its own departure.

Gen. Agha Mohammad Yahya Khan, the 52-year-old army commander to whom President Mohammad Ayub Khan handed over power last night, assured the nation in his first radio address: "I have no ambition other than to create conditions conducive to the establishment of a constitutional government."

There were no public protests anywhere in Pakistan against the takeover, which canceled the promise of a return to parliamentary democracy next year after 10 years of President Ayub's autocratic rule. Nowhere did the regime seek to make a strong show of force.

Diplomatic analysts here saw no indication at this stage of a shift in Pakistan's foreign policy as a result of the military takeover. They felt such a shift would have been likely only if an elected Government had come to power.

In Dacca, the capital of the East Pakistan, a detachment of 400 troops was stationed in the center of the city, hidden behind the walls of a stadium. It was Dacca's first day in more than three months without any shouting of slogans, demonstrations or strikes.

Students and teachers have gone back to colleges and universities after having stayed away for about three months. Sit-down in offices and factories have stopped and industries have begun to function normally.

East Appears Resigned

East Pakistanis, whose movement for provincial autonomy was thwarted by the takeover, appeared to resign themselves to the new order. But in private there were many who said it had destroyed the last chance to prevent an eventual partition of the ways between the two parts of Pakistan, which are divided by language and culture and by almost a thousand miles of Indian territory.

The 73,000,000 Bengalis of East Pakistan, the smaller of the two areas, account for more than half of the 128,000,000 population. But the country has been governed from the West by an elite, including the higher echelons of the armed forces, that is almost entirely from West Pakistan.

General Yahya and the five martial law administrators he has named are all from the West.

"This is the end of Pakistan," a young Bengali declared. "It may take 10 years or 15 years, but this is the end."

Sheik Barm Comment

Sheik Mujibur Rahman, the leader of the Awami League, which demands autonomy, was until last night widely considered a Prime Minister in Pakistan's next Government. Today, he refused to be interviewed at his home in Dacca.

"My hands are tied," he said. "They may come for me at any time."

As reporters turned to leave, he called out from his porch. "My people are with me, no one can suppress me."

Karachi apparently welcomed the takeover, if only because it promised a spell of calm after months of turmoil.

The political expectations of many people here appeared to have been satisfied a month ago by President Ayub's announcement that he would quit when his term ended.

The first action of the new regime was a series of harsh decrees outlawing strikes, agitation and criticism of any of the government's actions. The measures did not ban political parties.

The decrees, issued under the martial-law proclamation last night, prescribed penalties ranging from 30 lashes to 14 years in prison for acts designed to create "despondency" or "dissatisfaction toward the armed forces."

Under the decree, such acts could be "by word of mouth, or in writing, or by signals, or otherwise." Smuggling, looting, arson, or damage to public property can all be punished by hanging.

Criticism of the imposition of martial law or its administration can be punished by up to 10 years' imprisonment; the maximum sentence for striking is 14 years. Violators of the martial-law regulations are to be tried by special military tribunals. Death sentences will require General Yahya's approval.

General Explains Step

The army commander, who becomes the new head of state under the title of Chief Martial Law Administrator, said the "extreme step" of a military takeover had become necessary to save the country from "utter destruction."

Speaking slowly in English with a marked English accent, he said: "The situation described by President Ayub's announcement was a year ago by President Ayub's promise on Feb. 21 to make way for a democratic government. The rioting claimed more than 250 lives."

General Yahya did not mention East Pakistan specifically in connection with the violence, nor did he offer any estimate..."
Of how it had fallen, B said, only that he had concluded that 10 years of strongman rule, was not a situation to be endured. General Yahya, said that the administration had not yet faced the necessary for the military. Hadi was General Abullah's brother, the United States' aide-de-camp. The situation was reported as a minor incident involving members of the military. The State Department had not defended the President, but the United States was involved. The United States had expressed relief on the 74th anniversary of the National Independence. The majority of the military anti-American sentiment was as a result of the intervention of the United States in the fight against Pakistan. But the Afghan military had been supported by the United States in the fight against the Taliban.
Pakistan, a Moslem country carved out of the Indian subcontinent in 1947, is an unusual experiment in nation-building by their common religion, the two components, West Pakistan and East Pakistan, from the breakup of the British raj have clashed over the distribution of power and wealth.

The issues.

Although 60 per cent of the total population lives in East Pakistan and its jute exports provide at least half of the country's exports, the national government puts a disproportionate share of investment funds in the economic development of West Pakistan. As a result, East Pakistanis feel that few of them reach senior official positions in the national government and that the resulting imbalance tends to focus national concerns on West Pakistan.

Because of these disparities, East Pakistan has increasingly developed separatist tendencies and pressed for national elections as a vehicle to greater regional autonomy.

The natural setting.

West Pakistan, with an area of 310,000 square miles, five-sixths of the national territory, is a land of snowcapped mountains and arid deserts in which irrigation is essential for economic development. The main source of water is the Indus River. By contrast, East Pakistan is a humid, tropical region situated mainly among the wide-flung arms and channels of the combined delta of the Ganges and Brahmaputra rivers. While West Pakistan depends on costly irrigation projects, East Pakistan seems particularly after the summer monsoon rains.

Succession of Political Crises in Pakistan Reveal Deep Divisions

The New York Times, Thursday, March 27, 1969
of 22-Year-Old Country

POPULATION & LANGUAGE
Exposed for centuries to the culture of the Persians, the 68 million people of West Pakistan speak a Persianized, Modem form of Hindustani which they write with the Arabic script from right to left. Regional differences have produced the subcultures of the Punjab, the Pashtun, the Sindhis and the Baluchis.

East Pakistan, with its population of 72 million (or three-fifths of the national total), is inhabited by Bengalis, a more cohesive ethnic group that shares one of the great languages and cultures of the Indian subcontinent with their Bengali neighbors in India. The Bengalis use a distinctive script written from left to right.

Three-fourths of the population of Pakistan derives its livelihood from agriculture. In West Pakistan, wheat is the principal food crop, and cotton, and sugar cane are the main cash crops. Livestock raising for hides, meat and wool is also an important economic activity.

East Pakistan's humid tropical environment is most suitable to the cultivation of rice, which is the staple food of its population. The arms of the Ganges-Brahmaputra delta and tidal inlets of the Sea of Bengal make East Pakistan's major fish-producing area, and fish is a key item in the East Pakistani diet.

INDUSTRY
Most of Pakistan's limited mineral resources, coal, iron ores, chrome ore, natural gas and building materials, are found in West Pakistan, which has also most of the country's large scale industry. This includes—cotton mills, sugar refineries, tanneries, oil refineries, chemical plants.
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