Pentagon Refuses to Release Secret Study on U.S. Hegemony

Fulbright's Plea Rejected—McNamara Aide Says Report Could Stir Trouble Abroad

By E. W. KENWORTHY
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Feb. 15 — The Department of Defense has refused a request of Senator J. W. Fulbright to declassify and make public a secret study on how the United States can "maintain world hegemony in the future."

The study, completed two years ago by the Douglas Aircraft Corporation under Army sponsorship, was originally entitled "Pax Americana." Later it was titled "Strategic Alignments and Military Objectives." The study cost $89,500.

Last Nov. 29, Mr. Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, asked the Defense Department to declassify the document. He said he was making the request because the document involved foreign policy and "the important conclusions of the report" were in agreement with "so many recent statements made by Government officials."

He did not specify what these statements were and was not available for comment today.

In a reply on Dec. 14, Paul C. Warnke, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, said that "a great deal" of the material used by Douglas Aircraft in the study was available "in public media." But he said that the Defense Department was opposed to making the study public and would be opposed even if the classified material were deleted.

Mr. Warnke wrote to the Arkansas Democrat, "If the hypotheses, suggestions or conclusions contained in the study were construed as future policy of the United States, the study would be susceptible to misinterpretations and could produce serious repercussions abroad."

This refusal apparently ended Mr. Fulbright's effort, begun last October, to have the study made public. The study has been made available to him and he, in turn, has permitted other Senators to read it if they asked to do so.

Purpose Is Explained

In an earlier letter, Mr. Warnke had explained the primary purpose of the study as "to stimulate long-range planners to speculate on the impact on national security policies and requirements that various alternative future world alignments would have."

The New York Times
Paul C. Warnke

One Senator who has read the bulky report said today, "Some of its conclusions are scary—at least, they scare me." He declined to say what the conclusions were.

However, a student of foreign affairs who also read the study, while conceding that some of the conclusions were "scary," said, "The study reads like a freshman paper."

The Pentagon spends about $25-million a year on what is called "social science" research.

About $14-million goes to the Federal Research Contract Center, embracing such defense "think tanks" as the Rand Corporation, the Institute for Defense Analysis and the Research Analysis Corporation. About $10-million goes to universities and their related research organizations.

About $500,000 goes to industrial concerns that, largely for prestige reasons, maintain social science research departments. This was how Douglas came to do the "Pax Americana" study.

The story of that study began on April 29, 1965.

On that day the Commerce Business Daily, a publication of the Commerce Department listing contract awards and invitations to bid on such contracts, printed the following item:

"Services and materials, as required, to perform a research study entited 'Pax Americana' consisting of a phased study of the following: (A) elements of national power; (B) ability of selected nations to apply the elements of national power; (C) a variety of world power configurations to be used as a basis for the United States to maintain world hegemony in the future."

Noticed by Hartke

Bidders were invited to submit bids to the Army Research Office, 3045 Columbia Pike, Arlington, Va., before May 21. The contract was awarded to the Douglas Aircraft Corporation, which completed the report, after several time extensions, in February, 1966. The report was stamped "secret."

Some months ago Senator Vance Hartke, Democrat of Indiana, called Mr. Fullbrights attention to the bid invitation in the Commerce Business Daily. It could not be learned how it came to his attention so long after publication.

Last Oct. 13 Mr. Fulbright wrote to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara for a copy of "a study entitled 'Pax Americana.'"

On Oct. 26, Jack L. Stempler, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs, sent the Senator a copy with a covering letter saying that the title had been changed. Mr. Stempler continued:

"In order to avoid unnecessary and undesirable political repercussions involving the United States or foreign governments, Douglas performed the study only within the continental United States and exercised special discretion in making contracts. The final report was classified for these same reasons.

"It should be clearly understood that the study's conclusions and postulated objectives do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Defense."

On Nov. 8, Mr. Fulbright wrote Mr. Stempler asking the department's views "as to the desirability of declassifying this study." He also requested a copy of the contract and "supplementary correspondence," plus "a statement of the use which the Defense Department has made of the study and, specifically, an official estimate of the validity of each of the general conclusions."

Mr. Fulbright also asked for a list of similar studies during 1965, 1966 and 1967, and the contractors and sums involved.

"By similar studies," he wrote, "I have in mind those which the average American citizen would believe have a substantial relationship to the foreign policy of the United States."

Reason for Classifying

Mr. Warnke answered this letter on Nov. 18, and enclosed the requested contracts. It was in this letter that he defined the study's purpose as stimulating planners to speculate on the national security aspects of future world alignments.

He said that, because the general conclusions dealt with military objectives and alignments over the next 20 years, "it would be inappropriate to make official estimates of what their validity may be now."

As for declassification, Mr. Warnke said:

"Though much of the material in the report was derived from unclassified sources, the study should be classified due to the foreign policy sensitivity of the material when attribution is made to the United States Army."